

ing of security on a much more profound level. While we are trying to assure the safety of the country, we may be undermining it....

When Mr. Eisenhower was president of Columbia University, he said something that struck me. He had never been interested in defending property, or even lives, he said, as much as he had in defending a way of life. When you look at the proposition inherent in a nuclear exchange, you realize that even minimal losses—such as taking out New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles, and letting everything else stand—would spell the end of the American dream as we know it....

When Russia invaded Czechoslovakia last summer there was no violent resistance by the Czechs. You might ask whether this was wise or not. In one view, the Czech people were "chicken" for not standing up even though the odds were hopeless. But is the survival of a people and their culture not more important than a "heroic" gesture?...

Mr. HERZFELD. I am quite aware that even to contemplate the kind of calculations one must make in matters of military security causes real and valid revulsion in many people, and not just among the young. I must point out, however, that this revulsion is the kind that any nonmedical person feels when he accidentally walks into an operating room while an operation is going on. His reaction is valid, but it does not help him understand the problem of medicine very much.

ORDER FOR PRINTING EULOGIES OF SENATOR BARTLETT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that eulogies of Senator BARTLETT be printed as a Senate document for later distribution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION DURING ADJOURNMENTS FOR SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, during the ad-

journments of the Senate between today and next Tuesday, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator to say from adjournment now until next Tuesday?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am about to make that request.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY NEXT AT 10 A.M.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, upon the completion of its business today, the Senate adjourn until 10 a.m. on Friday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY TO TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1969

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately upon the conclusion of the reading of the Farewell Address on Friday, the Senate adjourn until noon, Tuesday, February 25, 1969.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY AT 10 A.M.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. on Friday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the Senate took an adjournment until Friday, February 21, 1969 at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 19, 1969:

IN THE AIR FORCE

Grant Hansen, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

G. Warren Nutter, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

IN THE AIR FORCE

John L. McLucas, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

Curtis W. Tarr, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

IN THE ARMY

Thaddeus R. Beal, of Massachusetts, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

Eugene M. Becker, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

William K. Brehm, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

IN THE NAVY

James D. Hittle, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

John G. Veneman, of California, to be Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

James E. Allen, Jr., of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

James E. Allen, Jr., of New York, to be Commissioner of Education.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL

Gilbert Hahn, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be Chairman of the District of Columbia Council for the term expiring February 1, 1972.

Sterling Tucker, of the District of Columbia, to be Vice Chairman of the District of Columbia Council for the term expiring February 1, 1972.

Jerry A. Moore, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Council for the term expiring February 1, 1972.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, February 19, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Reverend Ignatius L. Urbonas, pastor of St. Casimir Church, Gary, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who created all men free and equal, bless this country whose flag is a symbol of freedom to all nations.

God bless our President, our Government, and the Members of this Congress for their efforts in preserving this land free, and bless them for their endeavors for the freedom of other nations.

God bless all nations that seek freedom among which is Lithuania. In the sorrow of her enslavement she commemorates today the 51st anniversary of her declaration of independence.

Almighty God, we beseech You to aid all those who are oppressed and deprived of their freedom, to become free again and live in peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-74)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The blight of poverty requires priority attention. It engages our hearts and challenges our intelligence. It cannot and will not be treated lightly or indifferently, or without the most searching examination of how best to marshal the resources available to the Federal Government for combatting it.

At my direction, the Urban Affairs Council has been conducting an intensive study of the nation's anti-poverty programs, of the way the anti-poverty effort is organized and administered, and of ways in which it might be made more effective.

That study is continuing. However, I can now announce a number of steps I intend to take, as well as spelling out some of the considerations that will guide my future recommendations.

The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is now scheduled to expire on June 30, 1970. The present authorization for appropriations for the Office of Economic Opportunity runs only until June 30, 1969. I will ask Congress that this authorization for appropriations be extended for another year. Prior to the end of the Fiscal Year, I will send Congress a comprehensive proposal for the future of the poverty program, including recommendations for revising and extending the Act itself beyond its scheduled 1970 expiration.

How the work begun by OEO can best

be carried forward is a subject on which many views deserve to be heard—both from within Congress, and among those many others who are interested or affected, including especially the poor themselves. By sending my proposals well before the Act's 1970 expiration, I intend to provide time for full debate and discussion.

In the maze of anti-poverty efforts, precedents are weak and knowledge uncertain. These past years of increasing Federal involvement have begun to make clear how vast is the range of what we do not yet know, and how fragile are projections based on partial understanding. But we have learned some lessons about what works and what does not. The changes I propose will be based on those lessons and those discoveries, and rooted in a determination to press ahead with anti-poverty efforts even though individual experiments have ended in disappointment.

From the experience of OEO, we have learned the value of having in the Federal Government an agency whose special concern is the poor. We have learned the need for flexibility, responsiveness, and continuing innovation. We have learned the need for management effectiveness. Even those most thoroughly committed to the goals of the anti-poverty effort recognize now that much that has been tried has not worked.

The OEO has been a valuable fount of ideas and enthusiasm, but it has suffered from a confusion of roles.

OEO's greatest value is as an initiating agency—devising new programs to help the poor, and serving as an "incubator" for these programs during their initial, experimental phases. One of my aims is to free OEO itself to perform these functions more effectively, by providing for a greater concentration of its energies on its innovative role.

Last year, Congress directed that special studies be made by the Executive Branch of whether Head Start and the Job Corps should continue to be administered directly by OEO, or whether responsibility should be otherwise assigned.

Section 309 of the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 provides:

The President shall make a special study of whether the responsibility for administering the Head Start program established under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 should continue to be vested in the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, should be transferred to another agency of the Government or should be delegated to another such agency pursuant to the provisions of section 602(d) of the aforementioned Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and shall submit the findings of this study to the Congress not later than March 1, 1969.

I have today submitted this study to the Congress. Meanwhile, under the Executive authority provided by the Economic Opportunity Act, I have directed that preparations be made for the delegation of Head Start to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Whether it should be actually transferred is a question I will take up in my later, comprehensive message, along with my proposals for a permanent status and organizational structure for OEO. Pending a final decision by the Secretary of

HEW on where within the department responsibility for Head Start would be lodged, it will be located directly within the Office of the Secretary.

In order to provide for orderly preparation, and to ensure that there is no interruption of programs, I have directed that this delegation be made effective July 1, 1969. By then the summer programs for 1969 will all have been funded, and a new cycle will be beginning.

I see this delegation as an important element in a new national commitment to the crucial early years of life.

Head Start is still experimental. Its effects are simply not known—save of course where medical care and similar services are involved. The results of a major national evaluation of the program will be available this spring. It must be said, however, that preliminary reports on this study confirm what many have feared: the long term effect of Head Start appears to be extremely weak. This must not discourage us. To the contrary it only demonstrates the immense contribution the Head Start program has made simply by having raised to prominence on the national agenda the fact—known for some time, but never widely recognized—that the children of the poor mostly arrive at school age seriously deficient in the ability to profit from formal education, and already significantly behind their contemporaries. It also has been made abundantly clear that our schools as they now exist are unable to overcome this deficiency.

In this context, the Head Start Follow-Through Program already delegated to HEW by OEO, assumes an even greater importance.

In recent years, enormous advances have been made in the understanding of human development. We have learned that intelligence is not fixed at birth, but is largely formed by the environmental influences of the early formative years. It develops rapidly at first, and then more slowly; as much of that development takes place in the first four years as in the next thirteen. We have learned further that environment has its greatest impact on the development of intelligence when that development is proceeding most rapidly—that is, in those earliest years.

This means that many of the problems of poverty are traceable directly to early childhood experience—and that if we are to make genuine, long-range progress, we must focus our efforts much more than heretofore on those few years which may determine how far, throughout his later life, the child can reach.

Recent scientific developments have shown that this process of early childhood development poses more difficult problems than had earlier been recognized—but they also promise a real possibility of major breakthroughs soon in our understanding of this process. By placing Head Start in the Department of HEW, it will be possible to strengthen it by association with a wide range of other early development programs within the department, and also with the research programs of the National Institutes of Health, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the National In-

stitute of Child Health and Human Development.

Much of our knowledge is new. But we are not on that ground absolved from the responsibility to respond to it. So crucial is the matter of early growth that we must make a national commitment to providing all American children an opportunity for healthful and stimulating development during the first five years of life. In delegating Head Start to the Department of HEW, I pledge myself to that commitment.

The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 directed the Commissioner of Education to study the Job Corps in relation to state vocational education programs. I have directed the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Manpower, to work with the Acting Commissioner of Education in preparing such a report for submission to Congress at the earliest opportunity.

One of the priority aims of the new Administration is the development by the Department of Labor of a comprehensive manpower program, designed to make centrally available to the unemployed and the underemployed a full range of Federal job training and placement services. Toward this end, it is essential that the many Federal manpower programs be integrated and coordinated.

Therefore, as a first step toward better program management, the Job Corps will be delegated to the Department of Labor.

For the Department, this will add another important manpower service component. For the Job Corpsmen, it will make available additional training and service opportunities. From the standpoint of program management, it makes it possible to coordinate the Job Corps with other manpower services, especially vocational education, at the point of delivery.

The Department of Labor already is deeply involved in the recruitment, counseling and placement of Job Corpsmen. It refers 80 percent of all male and 45 percent of all female enrollees; it provides job market information, and helps locate Job Corpsmen in the areas of greatest opportunity.

This delegation will also be made effective on July 1, 1969; and the Departments of Interior and Agriculture will continue to have operating responsibility for the Job Corps centers concerned primarily with conservation.

I have directed that preparations be made for the transfer of two other programs from OEO to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Comprehensive Health Centers, which provide health service to the residents of poor neighborhoods, and Foster Grandparents program. In my judgement, these can be better administered at present, or in the near future, within the structure of the Department.

In making these changes, I recognize that innovation costs money—and that if OEO is to continue its effectiveness as an innovating agency, adequate funds must be made available on a continuing basis. Moreover, it is my intent that Community Action Agencies can continue to be involved in the operation of

programs such as Head Start at the local level, even though an agency other than OEO has received such programs, by delegation, at the national level. It also is my intent that the vital Community Action Programs will be pressed forward, and that in the area of economic development OEO will have an important role to play, in cooperation with other agencies, in fostering community-based business development.

One of the principal aims of the Administration's continuing study of the anti-poverty effort will be to improve its management effectiveness. When poverty-fund monies are stolen, those hurt most are the poor—whom the monies were meant to help. When programs are inefficiently administered, those hurt most again are the poor. The public generally, and the poor especially, have a right to demand effective and efficient management. I intend to provide it.

I expect that important economies will result from the delegation of the Job Corps to the Department of Labor, and we shall continue to strive for greater efficiency, and especially for greater effectiveness in Head Start.

A Concentrated Management Improvement Program initiated in OEO will be intensified. Under this program, selected Community Action Agencies will be required to take steps to devise improvements in such areas as organizational structure, financial and accounting systems, personnel training and work scheduling. Standards will be applied under the "management improvement program" to evaluate the operations of Community Action Agencies. We intend to monitor these programs actively in order to insure that they are achieving high-level effectiveness and that they are being administered on an orderly basis.

In the past, problems have often arisen over the relationship of State, county and local governments to programs administered by OEO. This has particularly been the case where the State and local officials have wanted to assume greater responsibility for the implementation of the programs but for various reasons have been prevented from doing so. I have assigned special responsibility for working out these problems to the newly-created Office of Intergovernmental Relations, under the supervision of the Vice President.

I have directed the Urban Affairs Council to keep the anti-poverty effort under constant review and evaluation, seeking new ways in which the various departments can help and better ways in which their efforts can be coordinated.

My comprehensive recommendations for the future of the poverty program will be made after the Urban Affairs Council's own initial study is completed, and after I have reviewed the Comptroller General's study of OEO ordered by Congress in 1967 and due for submission next month.

Meanwhile, I would stress this final thought: If we are to make the most of experimental programs, we must frankly recognize their experimental nature and frankly acknowledge whatever shortcomings they develop. To do so is not to belittle the experiment, but to advance its essential purpose: that of finding new

ways, better ways, of making progress in areas still inadequately understood.

We often can learn more from a program that fails to achieve its purpose than from one that succeeds. If we apply those lessons, then even the "failure" will have made a significant contribution to our larger purposes.

I urge all those involved in these experimental programs to bear this in mind—and to remember that one of the primary goals of this administration is to expand our knowledge of how best to make real progress against those social ills that have so stubbornly defied solution. We do not pretend to have all the answers. We are determined to find as many as we can.

The men and women who will be valued most in this administration will be those who understand that not every experiment succeeds, who do not cover up failures but rather lay open problems, frankly and constructively, so that next time we will know how to do better.

In this spirit, I am confident that we can place our anti-poverty efforts on a secure footing—and that as we continue to gain in understanding of how to master the difficulties, we can move forward at an accelerating pace.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 19, 1969.

INFORMATION ON EMPLOYEES WHO PARTICIPATED IN TRAINING IN NON-GOVERNMENT FACILITIES IN FISCAL YEAR 1968—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 1308(b) of title 5, United States Code, I am transmitting forms supplying information on those employees who, during Fiscal Year 1968, participated in training in non-Government facilities in courses that were over one hundred and twenty days in duration and those employees who received awards or contributions incident to training in non-Government facilities.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 19, 1969.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up

House Resolution 189 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 189

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1969, the Committee on Public Works, or any subcommittee thereof designated by the chairman, may make investigations into the following matters within its jurisdiction: In the United States, Commonwealths, territories, and possessions thereof, and Canada, public works projects either authorized or proposed to be authorized relating to flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors, waterpower, navigation, water pollution control, public buildings and grounds, roads and highways, as well as all other public works and economic and regional development matters within its jurisdiction.

For the purpose of making such investigations the committee or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places in the United States, Commonwealths, territories, and possessions thereof, and Canada, whether the House has recessed or adjourned, and to hold such hearings and require by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The committee may attend conferences and meetings on matters within its jurisdiction wherever held within the United States, Commonwealths, territories, and possessions thereof, and Canada.

The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject matter which is being investigated by any other standing committee of the House.

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States, Commonwealths, territories, and possessions thereof, and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Committee on Public Works for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, strike line 12, and insert in lieu thereof: "diction, and, in Mexico, and those Central American and South American countries in which the Pan American Highway is located, international roads and highways."

On page 2, line 5, strike the words "and Canada," and insert in lieu thereof: "Canada, Mexico, and those Central American and South American countries in which the Pan American Highway is located."

On page 2, line 17, strike the words "and Canada," and insert in lieu thereof: "Canada, Mexico, and those Central American and South American countries in which the Pan American Highway is located."

Strike all after line 20, page 2, and all of page 3, and insert in lieu thereof:

"Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code, for the purposes of carrying out the committee's authority in Canada, Mexico, and those Central American and South American countries in which the Pan American Highway is located: *Provided*, That (1) no mem-

ber or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

"Each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO CONDUCT CERTAIN STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 131 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 131

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1969, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee, including but not limited to the following:

(1) administration and operation of the Maritime Administration and Federal Maritime Commission and all laws, international arrangements, and problems relating to the American merchant marine;

(2) administration and operation of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and all laws and problems relating to fisheries and wildlife;

(3) administration and operation of the Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and all laws and problems relating to functions thereunder;

(4) administration and operation of the Panama Canal and all laws and problems relating thereto, together with the necessity of providing additional transiting facilities for vessels between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans;

(5) the natural resources and environment of the oceans;

Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

For such purposes the said committee, or any subcommittee thereof as authorized to do so by the chairman of the committee, is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress within or without the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpoena or otherwise

the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof designated by him may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190d of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

Each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. MARTIN) and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLING. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I rise simply for a point of information in anticipation of a future request for unanimous consent that the various committee authorizations and travel bills might be considered read and printed in the RECORD. They have been available to the Members. I, for one, have read them in advance. Therefore, if we could have the assurance of the distinguished gentleman from Missouri who is handling the resolutions on the floor, that they are in complete accord with the action of the Committee on Rules and that they are identical with past authorizing resolutions, we might be able to expedite the business of the House today in that manner.

Mr. BOLLING. I can so assure the gentleman from Missouri with regard to the resolutions I am handling. There are three of the group—and one of them has

already been passed—that are slightly different than they were last year. But the provisions about which the gentleman from Missouri is concerned and the restrictions that make the Members who use counterpart funds report thereon and so on and on, are present in each resolution. In other words, each one of these resolutions, although as I said previously, some of them are not identical with those of the last Congress, do conform to the policy that was established by the House last year with respect to these resolutions.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate the gentleman's lucid explanation. I notice that some of the ones we are now considering has the language which has come to be known as the "Hall amendment" which precludes any Member or employee of said committee receiving local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1964, whether he be in one or more different countries, or not.

Can the gentleman assure me that in addition to the language as to the use of counterpart funds, that the Committee on Rules has included this in these resolutions?

Mr. BOLLING. My understanding is that that matter is taken care of—taken care of both by the language of the Committee on Rules and also by the method of its administration by the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding and in my opinion we can act accordingly.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO CONDUCT CERTAIN STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 200 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 200

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor, effective from January 3, 1969, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct a full and complete study and investigation relating to all matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee: *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, including any Commonwealth or possession thereof, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers,

and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued only over the signature of the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee designated by him; they may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

The committee may report to the House of Representatives from time to time during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the Committee on Education and Labor for expenses of its members or other members or employees traveling abroad.

Mr. MARTIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS TO CONDUCT STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 192 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 192

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1969, the Committee on Science and Astronautics, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to any matter or matters in or related to the fields of astronautical research and development (including resources, personnel, equipment, and facilities), outer space (including exploration and control thereof, and air and space law), and other scientific research and development (including international scientific cooperation) coming within the jurisdiction of such committee: *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act within or without the United States, during the present Congress, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by

such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member designated by him may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its studies, investigations, and inquiries, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any such report which is made when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

Mr. MARTIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO CONDUCT INVESTIGATIONS AND STUDIES

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 152 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 152

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1969, the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee appointed by the chairman of the committee, is authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to all matters falling within the jurisdiction of the committee under rule XI, clause 4, of the Rules of the House of Representatives or any law of the United States including:

- (1) Banking and currency generally.
- (2) Control of price of commodities, rents, or services.
- (3) Deposit insurance.
- (4) Federal Reserve System.
- (5) Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees under this rule.
- (6) Gold and silver, including the coinage thereof.
- (7) Issuance of notes and redemption thereof.
- (8) Public and private housing.
- (9) Valuation and revaluation of the dollar.
- (10) Export controls.
- (11) International finance.
- (12) International trade.

Provided, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee may report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations as it considers advisable, during the present Congress.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution, the committee, or any of its subcommittees, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House has recessed or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary: *Provided*, That, for the purpose of carrying out this resolution, with respect to paragraphs (10), (11), and (12), the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act outside the United States.

Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee, or any member thereof designated by him, may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code, for the purposes of carrying out the committee's authority as set forth in paragraphs (10), (11), and (12) of this resolution: *Provided*, That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; and (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

Each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or, if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost

of such transportation and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

Mr. BOLLING (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Strike lines 9, 10, and 11, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(10) Export controls (the Export Control Act).

"(11) International finance (the Asian Development Bank Act, the Inter-American Development Bank Act, the International Finance Corporation, the International Monetary Fund, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development).

"(12) International trade (the Export-Import Bank Act)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 127 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 127

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1968, the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to make studies and investigations into the following matters:

(1) The restoration, expansion, and development of foreign markets for American agricultural products and of international trade in agricultural products; the use of agricultural commodities pursuant to Public Law 480, Eighty-third Congress, as amended, and the use of the foreign currencies accruing therefrom; and the effect of the European Common Market and other regional economic agreements and commodity marketing and pricing systems upon United States agriculture.

(2) All matters relating to the establishment and development of an effective Foreign Agricultural Service pursuant to title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954.

(3) All matters, relating to the development, use, and administration of the national forests, including but not limited to development of a sound program for general public use of the national forests consistent with watershed protection and sustained-yield timber management, and study of the forest fire prevention and control policies and activities of the Forest Service and their relation to coordinated activities of other Federal, State, and private agencies.

(4) Price spreads between producers and consumers.

(5) The formulation and development of improved programs for agricultural commodities; matters relating to the inspection grading, and marketing of such commodities; and the effect of trading in futures contracts for such commodities.

(6) The administration and operation of agricultural programs through State and county agricultural stabilization and conservation committees and the administrative policies and procedures relating to the selection, election, and operation of such committees.

(7) The development of upstream watershed projects authorized by Public Law 156, Eighty-third Congress, and the administration and development of watershed programs pursuant to Public Law 566, Eighty-third Congress, as amended; the development of land use programs pursuant to titles I and IV of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962; all programs of food assistance or distribution supported in whole or in part by funds authorized to be used by the Department of Agriculture.

(8) The implementation and administration of the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967 and Wholesome Poultry Products Act of 1968, including the establishment and development of inspection services as required by the Acts.

(9) All other matters within the jurisdiction of the committee: *Provided*, That the committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to make such inspections or investigations, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses.

The committee may report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) at any time during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall not be made available to the committee for expenses of its members or other members or employees traveling abroad.

Mr. MARTIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments: On page 3, line 25, strike all after the word "deems" and strike all of line 1, page 4, and insert: "necessary: *Provided*, That, for the purpose of carrying out this resolution, with respect to paragraph (1), the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act outside the United States. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of."

Strike all after line 11, page 4, and insert: "Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within

the United States; and, notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code, for the purposes of carrying out the committee's authority as set forth in paragraph (1) of this resolution: *Provided*, That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

"Each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING INVESTIGATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 143 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 143

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1969, the Committee on Foreign Affairs acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters—

(1) relating to the laws, regulations, directives, and policies including personnel pertaining to the Department of State and such other departments and agencies engaged primarily in the implementation of United States foreign policy and the overseas operations, personnel, and facilities of departments and agencies of the United States which participate in the development and execution of such policy;

(2) relating to the carrying out of programs and operations authorized by the Mutual Security Act and to other laws and measures to promote the foreign policy of the United States;

(3) relating to activities and programs of international organizations in which the United States participates;

(4) relating to the effectiveness of the United States programs of assistance and information; and

(5) relating to legislation within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs pursuant to provisions of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That the committee shall not un-

dertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, within or without the United States, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190d of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, That (1) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88-633, approved October 7, 1964; (2) no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

Each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the cost of such transportation, and the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the resolution be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMSAT BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4214) to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 with respect to the election of the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corp., and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice that this bill is being brought to the floor with a report which was printed only yesterday. I am concerned about the functioning of the Communications Satellite Corp., and therefore I would appreciate an explanation of the purpose of this particular bill.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from New York that when the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 was originally brought before the House it provided that the board of directors of Comsat would consist of three directors appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, six directors elected by stockholders, who were not communications common carriers, and between one and six, depending on their proportionate ownership of Comsat stock, directors representative of stockholders which were communications common carriers.

When it went to the other body, the other body amended the bill so as to provide for six carrier directors regardless of the amount of Comsat stock owned by them. Originally, the communications common carriers owned 50 percent of Comsat's stock but since that time their share of holdings have dropped to 38 percent.

All we are trying to do in this legislation is to relate carrier representation on the Comsat board of directors to the carriers' stockholdings in Comsat.

I recommend the passage of this bill because all it does, as I say, is to bring about justice where injustice was done by the law in the past.

Mr. RYAN. As the distinguished chairman may recall, at the time the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 was considered originally by the House, I led the floor fight against the proposal and raised a number of public policy issues which I felt then were important, and which I still do feel are important. I am particularly concerned about the control exercised in the Communications Satellite Corp. by the communications common carriers.

I take it the theory of this bill is to diminish their influence on the board of directors proportionately to their stockholdings. I agree—as far as it goes.

On the other hand, I am concerned that the carriers will continue to exercise as much power as this bill will permit.

My basic question is whether or not, by enacting this bill at this time, we will be precluding further consideration of the basic question of the concentration of power on the part of the common carriers.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAGGERS. This really takes part of the carriers' representation on the Comsat board away from them and gives it to the public who owns

the stock now. That is the reason I say it is purely rectifying an injustice. It was done by stating that six should come from the common carriers. They themselves recognizing the injustice have resigned.

Mr. RYAN. I understand the chairman's position. What I am concerned with more fundamentally is the effect of passing legislation which does not go to the heart of the matter.

Mr. STAGGERS. I understand what the gentleman means. That might come at a later time. We do not know. We simply are trying to rectify an injustice that was done.

Mr. RYAN. If I may ask a further question—since the creation of the Communications Satellite Corp. has the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had a thorough review of the whole operation of this corporation and, if not, is one contemplated?

Mr. STAGGERS. No, we have not. But we will. The President appointed a task force on communications policy which among other things considered Comsat's operations. I am sure this will be made public shortly. Our committee will then look into the matter.

Mr. RYAN. May I simply urge the distinguished chairman to conduct such an oversight review of the Communications Satellite Corp. and examine many of the basic questions that many of us raised at the time, and these questions I think are still valid.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I make this reservation in order to make an inquiry.

As I understand it, the degree or extent of the stockholders' interest in this corporation has now declined from 50 percent to about 38 percent.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is the stockholding of communications common carriers.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes, the common carriers' stockholders.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is right.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Does the gentleman happen to have a list of the concentration of stock in the companies involved in that 38 percent?

Mr. STAGGERS. No.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it true that one of these common carriers has about 30 percent of the stock?

Mr. STAGGERS. Approximately, I would say. I am not sure what that amount is. They do have a large amount.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Let me ask this question. If this be true, under this formula, as I understand it, the election of directors must be made in accordance with the amount of stock owned?

Mr. STAGGERS. No. Let us put it this way: When the law was set up, the common carriers were to have six of the directors.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes.

Mr. STAGGERS. The public was to have six directors, and the President was to appoint three directors. Under the provision that we have, two of the directors from the common carriers have already

resigned. They have said it was not fair that they be represented on the board.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Are those the directors that were from ITT?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is correct.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. They also pulled out of the corporation, did they not?

Mr. STAGGERS. No; they still own stock. They still own 100,000 shares of stock.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But it is their intention to leave the corporation?

Mr. STAGGERS. I imagine they will hold their stock.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. You think they will hold the stock?

Mr. STAGGERS. Oh, I think so.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But they are voluntarily relinquishing two directors?

Mr. STAGGERS. Two directors; yes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That seems a little strange, if they are going to hold the stock, that they are willing to release two directors who ostensibly could guard their interest in stockholders' meetings.

Mr. STAGGERS. The two directors will now come from the public.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. These two directors?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes; if the bill is passed. The selection of the two directors would go to the public stockholders.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The formula that you have here would not be applicable to the numbers of stockholders that would be elected by one corporation? In other words, if one corporation owns a block representing thirty thirty-eighths of the aforementioned 38 percent, or better than 76 percent, of the 38 percent, would it be entitled to more than one director?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes; I think they would under the formula that was originally set up.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Does it concern the committee—

Mr. STAGGERS. It does.

Mr. HOLIFIELD (continuing). That this change in legislation would permit one corporation to have more than one director?

Mr. STAGGERS. The bill would not affect the previous formula whatever, except the fact that instead of directing that six stockholders shall come from the common carriers, the bill provides that the number of Comsat directors representing the carriers shall be proportionate to the carriers' holdings.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I understand that.

Mr. STAGGERS. The common carriers stockholdings in Comsat have dropped from 50 percent down to 38 percent.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I understand that. There are two things involved: The drop in interest from 50 percent to 38 percent in the total amount of the common carriers' stock; second—and the point to which I am directing my question to the chairman—is the concern that one corporation owning 76.1 percent of the 38 percent held by common carriers will be entitled to more than one director.

Mr. STAGGERS. Of course, I am concerned, and I think everybody is. But I say again that this provision will help to rectify it, because it would give the public two more directors, which would make the setup 8 to 4 for the general public, and the President appoints three.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I have a great deal

of confidence in the gentleman. I am not well informed on this particular subject. But in reading the report, which I received only 30 minutes ago, the thought occurred to me that this matter should be brought out for discussion. If the gentleman and his committee recommend this, notwithstanding the fact that one corporation would be entitled to a disproportionate amount of the four directors that are left—I would assume on the basis of the stock ownership of the 38 percent that is owned by corporations, that they would be entitled to two or more directors out of the four—if that does not concern the gentleman or his committee, and I assume that the committee has looked into this matter and feel that this is not an undue concentration of power in one participating corporation, I have no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Communications Satellite Act, when passed, anticipated that the communications common carriers such as American Telephone & Telegraph, Western Union, and the like would always wish to retain half of the stock of the corporation being set up to manage communications satellites. In the beginning of corporate operation this was so. As time went on, however, one such common carrier saw fit to dispose of a large proportion of its stock to non-communications stockholders. The stock itself is not divided into classes but the kinds of entities which may own it are so divided, being the communications common carriers and the general public. Because the act provided for the election of directors on the assumption that the stock would be equally or nearly equally divided, it left unprovided for that situation which now exists, that is, a board of directors not representative of the actual stock holdings.

The purpose of this legislation is to amend the act to correct the situation. All parties to the situation agree that it is just and desirable. In fact, the possibility of just this situation was recognized by the House of Representatives in 1962 when the act was first passed but provisions for its resolution were deleted from the final version agreed upon between the House and Senate. And now it is proposed that a formula be included in the law with authorization to the stockholders to amend the articles of incorporation accordingly.

The President chooses three of the 15 directors. The remaining 12 would no longer be chosen one-half by the carriers and one-half by the public stockholders. When carrier stockholdings are between 40 and 45 percent, they will elect five. As the stockholding of the carriers declines—if it does—the number of directors elected by them will also decline, until at 8 percent or under they will elect no directors.

In order to make the procedure simple and orderly, it will be done only at the time of the annual meetings. This may mean that, during any given year, there may be a period of time when the board

of directors does not exactly reflect the proportionate stockholdings of the two classes of owners, but this seems to be fair enough and very practical.

There is urgency that the change be made promptly. The annual meeting of the Comsat Corp. takes place in a few months. If notices can reflect this piece of business, it can be handled then. The alternative is a special meeting with all the attendant inconvenience and expense, both of which would be considerable.

One other change in the law included in this bill would allow the corporation, in an emergency situation, to operate without full participation by its board. States and communities have provision for such emergency operation by law. Federal agencies have such authority by a series of Executive orders. Many private concerns have special provisions for operations in extreme national emergency conditions. Obviously none of these arrangements are intended to apply to less than full-scale national catastrophe. In order to leave no doubt of the limitation of the extraordinary authority, the committee has made it applicable only to national emergencies specifically declared in the future. In any full-scale national emergency the functioning of these vital communications links would be essential. The success of all other emergency plans, governmental and otherwise, would require making full use of available communications facilities. The change in the act suggested here should make that more possible as far as satellite communications are concerned.

The temporary international agreement by which Comsat manages the satellites used for international purposes is about to be negotiated. A permanent arrangement is contemplated and it is to be expected that the Communications Satellite Corp. will have some role to play in the carrying out of such final plans. It is well to have the corporation house in good order for this purpose also.

I recommend the legislation as it has come from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4214

A bill to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 with respect to the election of the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a), of section 303 of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 (47 U.S.C. 733 (a)) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 303. (a) The corporation shall have a board of directors consisting of fifteen individuals who are citizens of the United States, of whom one shall be elected annually by the board to serve as chairman. Three members of the board shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, effective the date on which the other members are elected, and for terms of three years

or until their successors have been appointed and qualified, and any member so appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the director whom he succeeds. The remaining twelve members of the board shall be elected annually by the stockholders. Six of such members shall be elected by those stockholders who are not communications common carriers, and the remaining six such members shall be elected by the stockholders who are communications common carriers, except that if

the number of shares of the voting capital stock of the corporation issued and outstanding and owned either directly or indirectly by communications common carriers as of the record date for the annual meetings of stockholders is less than 45 per centum of the total number of shares of the voting capital stock of the corporation issued and outstanding, the number of members to be elected at such meeting by each group of stockholders shall be determined in accordance with the following table:

When the number of shares of the voting capital stock of the corporation issued and outstanding and owned either directly or indirectly by communications common carriers is less than—	But not less than—	The number of members which stockholders who are communications common carriers are entitled to elect shall be—		And the number of members which other stockholders are entitled to elect shall be—	
45 per centum.....	40 per centum.....	5	7		
40 per centum.....	35 per centum.....	4	8		
35 per centum.....	25 per centum.....	3	9		
25 per centum.....	15 per centum.....	2	10		
15 per centum.....	8 per centum.....	1	11		
8 per centum.....		0	12		

No stockholder who is a communications common carrier and no trustee for such a stockholder shall vote, either directly or indirectly, through the votes of subsidiaries or affiliated companies, nominees, or any persons subject to his direction or control, for more than three candidates for membership on the board, except that in the event the number of shares of the voting capital stock of the corporation issued and outstanding and owned either directly or indirectly by communications common carriers as of the record date for the annual meeting is less than 8 per centum of the total number of shares of the voting capital stock of the corporation issued and outstanding, any stockholder who is a communications common carrier shall be entitled to vote at such meeting for candidates for membership on the board in the same manner as all other stockholders. Subject to the foregoing limitations, the articles of incorporation of the corporation shall provide for cumulative voting under section 27(d) of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 29-11(d)). The articles of incorporation of the corporation may be amended, altered, changed, or repealed by a vote of not less than 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ per centum of the outstanding shares of the voting capital stock of the corporation owned by stockholders who are communications common carriers and by stockholders who are not communications common carriers, voting together, if such vote complies with all other requirements of this Act and of the articles of incorporation of the corporation with respect to the amendment, alteration, change, or repeal of such articles. The corporation may adopt such by laws as shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 36 of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 29-916d), provide in the event of a national emergency for the continued ability of the board to transact business."

Sec. 2. As promptly as the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation shall determine to be practical after the date of the enactment of this Act, a meeting of the stockholders of the corporation shall be called for the purpose of electing twelve members of the board in accordance with subsection (a) of section 303 of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 as amended by the first section of this Act. The members of the board elected at such meeting shall serve until the next annual meeting of stockholders or until their successors have been elected and qualified.

Sec. 3. The status and authority of the members of the board of directors of the

Communications Satellite Corporation who were elected to the board before the date of the enactment of this Act and who are serving as members of the board on such date shall not be in any way impaired or affected until their successors have been elected and qualified in accordance with section 2 of this Act.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, strike out the sentence beginning in line 4 of the bill (as introduced) and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The corporation may adopt such bylaws as shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 36 of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 29-916d), provide for the continued ability of the board to transact business under such circumstances of national emergency as the President of the United States, or the officer designated by him, may determine, after February 18, 1969, would not permit a prompt meeting of a majority of the board to transact business."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

When the number of shares of the voting capital stock of the corporation issued and outstanding and owned either directly or indirectly by communications common carriers is less than—	But not less than—	The number of members which stockholders who are communications common carriers are entitled to elect shall be—		And the number of members which other stockholders are entitled to elect shall be—	
45 per centum.....	40 per centum.....	5	7		
40 per centum.....	35 per centum.....	4	8		
35 per centum.....	25 per centum.....	3	9		
25 per centum.....	15 per centum.....	2	10		
15 per centum.....	8 per centum.....	1	11		
8 per centum.....		0	12		

No stockholder who is a communications common carrier and no trustee for such a stockholder shall vote, either directly or indirectly, through the votes of subsidiaries or affiliated companies, nominees, or any persons subject to his direction or control, for more than three candidates for membership on the board, except that in the event the number of shares of the voting capital stock of the corporation issued and outstanding and owned either directly or indirectly by communications common carriers as of the record date for the annual meeting is less

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a similar Senate bill, S. 17, to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 with respect to the election of the board of the Communications Satellite Corp.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 17

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 303(a) of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 (47 U.S.C. 733(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 303. (a) The corporation shall have a board of directors consisting of fifteen individuals who are citizens of the United States, of whom one shall be elected annually by the board to serve as chairman. Three members of the board shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, effective the date on which the other members are elected, and for terms of three years or until their successors have been appointed and qualified, and any member so appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the director whom he succeeds. The remaining twelve members of the board shall be elected annually by the stockholders. Six of such members shall be elected by those stockholders who are not communications common carriers, and the remaining six such members shall be elected by the stockholders who are communications common carriers, except that if the number of shares of the voting capital stock of the corporation issued and outstanding and owned either directly or indirectly by communications common carriers as of the record date for the annual meeting of stockholders is less than 45 per centum of the total number of shares of the voting capital stock of the corporation issued and outstanding, the number of members to be elected at such meeting by each group of stockholders shall be determined in accordance with the following table:

When the number of shares of the voting capital stock of the corporation issued and outstanding and owned either directly or indirectly by communications common carriers is less than—	But not less than—	The number of members which stockholders who are communications common carriers are entitled to elect shall be—		And the number of members which other stockholders are entitled to elect shall be—	
45 per centum.....	40 per centum.....	5	7		
40 per centum.....	35 per centum.....	4	8		
35 per centum.....	25 per centum.....	3	9		
25 per centum.....	15 per centum.....	2	10		
15 per centum.....	8 per centum.....	1	11		
8 per centum.....		0	12		

than 8 per centum of the total number of shares of the voting capital stock of the corporation issued and outstanding, any stockholder who is a communications common carrier shall be entitled to vote at such meeting for candidates for membership on the board in the same manner as all other stockholders. Subject to the foregoing limitations, the articles of incorporation of the corporation shall provide for cumulative voting under section 27(d) of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 29-911(d)). The articles of incor-

poration of the corporation may be amended, altered, changed, or repealed by a vote of not less than 66 2/3 per centum of the outstanding shares of the voting capital stock of the corporation owned by stockholders who are communications common carriers and by stockholders who are not communications common carriers, voting together, provided that such vote complies with all other requirements of this Act and of the articles of incorporation of the corporation with respect to the amendment, alteration, change, or repeal of such articles. The corporation may adopt such bylaws as shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 36 of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 29-916d), provide in the event of a national emergency for the continued ability of the board to transact business."

Sec. 2. As promptly as the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation shall determine to be practical after this Act takes effect, a meeting of the stockholders of the corporation shall be called for the purpose of electing twelve members of the board in accordance with section 1 of this Act. The members of the board elected at such meeting shall serve until the next annual meeting of stockholders or until their successors have been elected and qualified.

Sec. 3. The status and authority of the members of the board of the Communications Satellite Corporation who were elected in conformity with the provisions of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 prior to amendment by this Act and who are serving when this Act takes effect shall not be in any way impaired or affected until their successors have been elected and qualified in accordance with section 2 of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAGGERS: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 17 and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 4214, as passed, as follows:

"That subsection (a) of section 303 of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 (47 U.S.C. 733(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 303. (a) The corporation shall have a board of directors consisting of fifteen individuals who are citizens of the United States, of whom one shall be elected annually by the board to serve as chairman. Three members of the board shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, effective the date on which the other members are elected, and for terms of three years or until their successors have been appointed and qualified, and any member so appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the director whom he succeeds. The remaining twelve members of the board shall be elected annually by the stockholders. Six of such members shall be elected by those stockholders who are not communications common carriers, and the remaining six such members shall be elected by the stockholders who are communications common carriers, except that if the number of shares of the voting capital stock of the corporation issued and outstanding and owned either directly or indirectly by communications common carriers as of the record date for the annual meeting of stockholders is less than 45 per centum of the total number of shares of the voting capital stock of the corporation issued and outstanding, the number of members to be elected at such meeting by each group of stockholders shall be determined in accordance with the following table:

"When the number of shares of the voting capital stock of the corporation issued and outstanding and owned either directly or indirectly by communications common carriers is less than—

	The number of members which stockholders who are communications common carriers are entitled to elect shall be—	And the number of members which other stockholders are entitled to elect shall be—
But not less than—		
45 per centum	40 per centum	5
40 per centum	35 per centum	4
35 per centum	25 per centum	3
25 per centum	15 per centum	2
15 per centum	8 per centum	1
8 per centum		0
		12"

No stockholder who is a communications common carrier and no trustee for such a stockholder shall vote, either directly or indirectly, through the votes of subsidiaries or affiliated companies, nominees, or any persons subject to his direction or control, for more than three candidates for membership on the board, except that in the event the number of shares of the voting capital stock of the corporation issued and outstanding and owned either directly or indirectly by communications common carriers as of the record date for the annual meeting is less than 8 per centum of the total number of shares of the voting capital stock of the corporation issued and outstanding, any stockholder who is a communications common carrier shall be entitled to vote at such meeting for candidates for membership on the board in the same manner as all other stockholders. Subject to the foregoing limitations, the articles of incorporation of the corporation shall provide for cumulative voting under section 27(d) of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 29-911(d)). The articles of incorporation of the corporation may be amended, altered, changed, or repealed by a vote of not less than 66 2/3 per centum of the outstanding shares of the voting capital stock of the corporation owned by stockholders

who are communications common carriers and by stockholders who are not communications common carriers, voting together, if such vote complies with all other requirements of this Act and of the articles of incorporation of the corporation with respect to the amendment, alteration, change, or repeal of such articles. The corporation may adopt such bylaws as shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 36 of the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 29-916d), provide for the continued ability of the board to transact business under such circumstances of national emergency as the President of the United States, or the officer designated by him, may determine, after February 18, 1969, would not permit a prompt meeting of a majority of the board to transact business."

"Sec. 2. As promptly as the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation shall determine to be practical after the date of the enactment of this Act, a meeting of the stockholders of the corporation shall be called for the purpose of electing twelve members of the board in accordance with subsection (a) of section 303 of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 as amended by the first section of this Act. The members of the board elected at such meeting shall serve until the next annual meet-

ing of stockholders or until their successors have been elected and qualified.

"Sec. 3. The status and authority of the members of the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation who were elected to the board before the date of the enactment of this Act and who are serving as members of the board on such date shall not be in any way impaired or affected until their successors have been elected and qualified in accordance with section 2 of this Act."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 with respect to the election of the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STAGGERS

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title Amendment Offered by Mr. STAGGERS: Amend the title of the bill to read: "To amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 with respect to the election of the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corporation."

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 4214) was laid on the table.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE HOUSE BEAUTY SHOP

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 258 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 258

Resolved, That (a) effective January 3, 1969, there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of three Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom shall be designated as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(b) Until otherwise ordered by the House, the management of the House Beauty Shop and all matters connected therewith shall be under the direction of the Select Committee herein created and shall be operated under such rules and regulations as such Committee may prescribe for the operation and the employment of necessary assistance for the conduct of said Beauty Shop by such business methods as may produce the best results consistent with economical and modern management.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOUSE BEAUTY SHOP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 258, 91st Congress, the Chair appoints as members

of the Select Committee on the House Beauty Shop the following Members of the House: Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, and Mrs. MAY.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION OF COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. DINGELL, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE SST—A BIZARRE ASSAULT UPON GOVERNMENT SOLVENCY AND THE QUALITY OF AMERICAN LIFE

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PODELL, Mr. Speaker, \$500 million in Government funds has already been thrown away on development of the supersonic plane, or SST. A decision shortly must be made regarding further investment of public money in this project; \$600 million is the sum in question which we shall have to make available if development of the SST is to continue. I wish to place myself vehemently on record as opposed to further investment in this gargantuan piece of nonsense. Have we not had enough of such incredible boondoggles? Are the American people not utterly disgusted with such astronomical strivings based on business greed and prestige rather than on national necessity and meeting of real needs of our people?

We have poured a fortune into a flying deathtrap called the TFX. Already there is talk that the new Lockheed transport is going to soar in price to the point where Government would find it cheaper to buy Lockheed rather than purchase their plane.

Now the SST is proposed and advocated. What is it? A sonic boom across a continent, shattering our windows, solitude, and peace of mind. And the people behind this unbelievable idiocy demand that Government and the taxpayer subsidize this awful prospect.

People are starving to death in this Nation. Our cities are cesspools of crime, drug addiction, traffic, pollution, and expense. Yet we pour billions down the throats of those who are making it worse, perpetrating such atrocities and who propose to do still more. I say we must stop it.

The SST is as unrealistic in concept and useless in goal as the ABM, foreign aid to our enemies, bigger cars, more cars, the Vietnam tragedy, and orange groves in Greenland. The American public will not subsidize this atrocity.

I pray that the SST be relegated to

the junkpile reserved for projects that are nonsensical, useless, and certainly not beneficial to the American national interest.

Aircraft are already in flight which can serve the purposes of the SST, although they will not create a continent-spanning sonic boom. It is my hope that we shall make such craft do the job.

In the meantime, let us put the SST aside and let it collapse quietly as all such projects do when placed strictly upon their merits. How incredible to propose a mode of transport that will get people across a continent faster so they will be able to spend more time in the traffic jams of our cities.

A nation stands or falls on its abilities to ascertain and follow through on national priorities. Placing the SST before ending pollution, mass urban transit, and low-cost housing makes as much sense as trying to obtain light from a cucumber or making a sheep bark.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not unscramble our priorities, our Nation will slide into the abyss. We cannot afford such national stupidities. The Nation demands that we concentrate on the needs of the majority rather than the special interests of the few.

PROPOSAL BANNING ALL CIGARETTE ADVERTISING ON RADIO AND TELEVISION BY FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

(Mr. ABBITT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ABBITT, Mr. Speaker, on February 5 the Federal Communications Commission proposed the banning of all cigarette advertising on the Nation's radio and television stations.

This is another example of a growing number of instances in which various Federal agencies have attempted to arbitrarily increase their power and extend the scope of their operations.

The announcement by the Federal Communications Commission is clearly outside the jurisdiction which Congress has delegated to that agency and is designed, in my opinion, to intimidate Congress. It is a clear usurpation of congressional authority and I, for one, propose to do everything I can to prevent the FCC or any other agency from arrogating unto itself powers never intended by the very legislative authority which established the regulatory agency.

This is a subject which has received much attention in recent years. The Cigarette Labeling Act which was passed in 1965 after extensive hearings provides information which reflects the proven facts about smoking and health. Proposals are already pending to extend the current law and it is the business of Congress to take whatever legislative action is necessary in keeping with the public interest.

It is not the prerogative of the FCC to take capricious action to prevent manufacturers of cigarettes from advertising—certainly on the basis of the contradictory medical evidence which is now available.

This is more than a health issue; it is

a constitutional question. If the Federal Communications Commission can ban cigarette advertising it can also operate to curtail the advertising of other products—and if this can be done, presumably the authority would extend to outright censorship and complete control of the broadcast content of radio and television.

I do not believe that the American people want or will stand for Government control of what they see or hear on the broadcast media. This is the very thing which many of us have striven to prevent under our democratic form of government. The freedom to speak also carries with it the freedom to advertise—unless there is some proven basis that the product in question is a detriment to the health and well-being of the public. Such a basis has not been proven and many Government agencies disagree on the information which is presently available on this subject.

The proposed edict of the FCC that all cigarette advertising should be banned is nothing more than a grasp for power by a Federal agency and exceeds the regulatory functions which Congress has vested in the agency.

The notice of proposed rulemaking is only a first step in bringing about the control which FCC seeks. Either that is the case or the FCC is guilty of incredible gullibility in accepting one set of conclusions in the matter of smoking and health while utterly ignoring other conclusions of perhaps much greater validity. It is up to Congress to step in and call a halt to this before it gets out of hand. It is equally the duty and responsibility of Congress to protect legitimate industry. The latest proposal together with previous actions by the FCC and other agencies have all the earmarks of the grand strategy to destroy an industry. Those who are concerned about the rights of free speech should also be concerned lest the action sought by the FCC is merely a forerunner to complete Government censorship.

THE COAL MINE SAFETY PROPOSALS

(Mr. SLACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SLACK, Mr. Speaker, many of us who have sponsored proposals to secure stronger mine safety laws have watched events of the past few weeks with consternation.

This is a life-and-death issue for thousands of Americans.

It is not a television spectacular.

It is not a private carriage designed to draw a select few to positions of political prominence.

No miner has died or been crippled underground so that a handful of self-appointed experts can pose dramatically on the public stage as saviors of them all.

But the deadly force of recent mine disasters has directed such attention to the issue that we can say with some certainty the time for remedial legislation has arrived. The public demands it.

And we cannot begin formal consider-

ation of the many pending proposals too soon. The sooner we begin, the quicker we will be able to work out legislation which can be passed, and which can be effective after passage.

The sooner we begin, the quicker we will be able to focus public attention on the facts and shift the emphasis away from the chatterings of the uninformed.

It is my own personal conviction that stronger Federal mine safety legislation alone will not bring completely acceptable conditions of work underground. We must look further afield for that, and only prolonged research will assure us of suitable end results.

But in the immediate present we can reduce the human risk in mining substantially through the adoption of realistic, enforceable additions to the language of present laws.

As a cosponsor of one such proposal, I am dismayed by the trend of recent publicity—by the callous, heartless, self-promotional antics of the few who have appointed themselves arbiters of mine safety standards.

If there is one common denominator among the pending mine safety proposals it is the fact that they all lean heavily on the regulation-enforcement-prosecution process. Pending proposals call for enforcement through penalties on the operators, but also for fines levied against the miners themselves, ranging up to \$1,000 for infraction against the new law.

With 6,500 operating mines, we find that the budget for the new fiscal year calls for funds to support less than 300 mine safety inspector positions, and unless we plan to authorize and fund work for several thousand mine inspectors, then we must look elsewhere for the energies to stimulate such a mass compliance and mass education program. In the coalfields, the United Mine Workers of America has the required experience and level of acceptance to do the job. In fact, it is unlikely that any new laws aimed at improving mine safety and health conditions can muster significant impact on present conditions without the active support and dedicated leadership of the United Mine Workers of America as part of its continuing program to improve working conditions in all respects.

The effects of coal mine disasters do not stop with the miner and his family. They are equally disastrous for the union and the operator. They are continuing reminders that conditions must be improved to exert more control over a dangerous environment, and that a careless mistake can be very expensive and totally disruptive for the operator. There is no qualified spokesman for any mining interest who is opposed to safer working conditions, if it can be established that new regulations will mitigate an identified danger without destructive cost increases.

Since there is growing agreement that new safety legislation must come about, we would do well to ask ourselves the purpose behind the recent wave of headline grabbing, and the ugly assertions that neither the operators nor the union really care about safety for the miners. What is the purpose of the effort to sow

division and distrust throughout the mining industry?

The situations suggest that they do not want betterment of mine safety conditions, they want exposure for themselves. Like the rioters on our college campuses and in the streets, they are not interested in improved conditions, but only in demonstrations for their own sake.

Under the circumstances we must move to consider the mine safety proposals in committee at the earliest possible date. That is the proper forum for expression of all views. There are medical experts who have taken a stand on both sides of a health controversy. There are experts in all phases of mining who have much to offer us. There are as many unknown as there are known factors to consider. The orderly approach through committee hearings is called for, not a continuing barrage of assertions and unsupported statements.

Meanwhile, let there be a moratorium on silly charges against "the interest," and a pause in the finger pointing at UMW President Boyle, Vice President George Titler, and their colleagues.

Let us have law, based on fact, and let us define by law what must be done. Having passed a good law, we can be confident that Mr. Boyle, Mr. Titler, and the knowledgeable leadership of the United Mine Workers of America will claim their usual position in the van of a vigorous drive for safer conditions in coal mining.

THE TERRORIST ATTACK ON THE EL-AL AIRCRAFT IN ZURICH, SWITZERLAND

(Mr. FARBERSTEIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the terrorist attack on the El-Al aircraft as it sat on the runway at Kloten International Airport in Zurich, Switzerland, yesterday can only be considered both cowardly and insane—cowardly because it was again an attack against civilians who have no part in the dispute between the Arab and Israel Governments, and insane because of its possible ramifications.

Now that it is admitted that the terrorist organization that is responsible for this murderous attack—and for the previous attack on another El-Al aircraft on the runway at Athens, Greece, on December 26, 1968—is based in Jordan and the King of Jordan has publicly stated his support for that terrorist organization, will the United Nations, through the Security Council, now act to condemn the Government of Jordan? Or will this attack be called the act of an independent liberation group about which the Jordanian Government disclaims responsibility, or even knowledge. Will the Security Council now pass a resolution looking toward the prevention of similar attacks. I submit the Security Council must fix responsibility on the Government of Jordan from which this terrorist organization emanates and direct the Government of Jordan to take speedy steps toward liquidating not alone that

organization but all such organizations based within its territory.

This is economic warfare aimed at the destruction of the Israeli international air services—it is not a war of belligerent armies. Raids such as these cannot be executed without financial and military support from within the Arab community. The Arab governments which have given support to the terrorists must be called to account for the activities of these clandestine organizations.

It is time for the world to see things as they are—and to place the blame where it belong—on the Arab governments who condone these violent acts of terrorism.

Failure on the part of the United Nations to act promptly may well trigger retaliatory action by the Israelis. How long can a nation's patience be taxed? How long will there be one-sided condemnation? If there is to be equal justice for all nations, then the United Nations must act promptly and honestly and condemn, not only the terrorist organization's actions but the government of the country which condones—and even assists—them.

LITHUANIA NEEDS OUR NATION'S HELP

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Ignatius Urbonas, pastor of St. Casimir's Church, of Gary, Ind., on this date, February 19, 1969, was assigned the honor and distinction of officially opening this session of Congress by offering prayer as substitute Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

Reverend Urbonas is one of the leaders of the Lithuanian American Council who is carrying on the campaign to eventually restore freedom to his native land. I wish to incorporate with my remarks a letter I received today from Albert G. Vinick and Peter Indreika, president and chairman, respectively, of the Lithuanian American Council of the Calumet Region. I also include a resolution unanimously passed at their meeting at St. Casimir's Church hall in Gary, Ind., last Sunday.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL,
Lake County, Ind., February 16, 1969.

HON. RAY J. MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MADDEN: The Lithuanian Americans of the Calumet Region, located in the Northwestern part of Indiana, assembled in St. Casimir's Church Hall, 1390 W. 15th Avenue, Gary, Indiana, on Sunday, February 16, 1969, upon presentation and due consideration, unanimously passed the enclosed resolution.

We sincerely thank you for any help that you may give our people, by placing this resolution where it may do the most good.

Sincerely yours,
ALBERT G. VINICK,
President.
PETER INDREIKA.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, in 1940 the Kremlin rulers in conspiracy with Hitlerite Germany and in brutal violation of the international law, invaded

Lithuania, and against the will of Lithuanian people, annexed her to the Soviet Union.

Whereas, the people of Lithuania have been and still are suppressed by the most cruel means of Communist dictatorship; her culture is distorted, her industry and agriculture ruined, her youth by thousands every year are shipped to indoctrination camps for further training in communism, and

Whereas, the Soviet dictatorship constantly strives to extend its rule over new territories in Europe, in Asia, and in Africa, and seeks to dominate the whole world,

Therefore, be it resolved, that this gathering of Loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent of Lake County, State of Indiana, calls upon the Government of the United States to stand firm against the expansion of communistic imperialism and to do all in its power to prevent further spreading of communism in the free world; be it further

Resolved, that it is our consensus that American leadership in the fight for freedom and peace will be best exerted, by inaugurating strong and dynamic policy aimed not only at preventing further expansion of communist imperialism but also abolishing the fruits of all past Kremlin aggressions and by intensifying the American campaign for truth inside the Iron Curtain, and by enlightening the American people and the peoples of the world as to methods and practices applied by the Soviets in their struggle for world domination.

GROWING PROBLEM OF MISUSE OF DRUGS AMONG YOUNG PEOPLE

(Mr. MARSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that one of the most urgent and pressing problems confronting Americans today is the growing problem of misuse of drugs, particularly among young people.

It is important that this problem have highest priority in the 91st Congress.

The misuse of drugs, particularly marihuana, is a nationwide problem that is not limited as to race, class, or community. In fact, the smoking of marihuana, sometimes called "pot" or "grass," is plaguing middle-class families and is just as likely to be found in suburbia as in the ghetto.

Educators are concerned about it, not only on the university campus, but also at high schools and even, in some instances, in junior high schools.

It is of mounting concern in the armed services, as evidenced by greater attention to this problem in defense publications and in statements by such civilian leaders as Secretary of the Army Resor, who indicated recently that defense officials were focusing greater attention on this problem.

The danger of the use of marihuana is in creating a dependency on the drug and, second, in marking a first step toward possible addiction to what are called "hard" narcotics.

It is necessary to take a new look at the question of illicit use of, and traffic in, drugs, and the answer is not to be found simply in passing more laws.

Greater emphasis should be placed on education and rehabilitation, with stricter enforcement of narcotics laws on people who peddle drugs and are referred to as "pushers." These are the people who should be prosecuted vigorously and punished.

There is a relationship between the spiraling crime rate and the use of drugs. In fact, the growing rate of theft, larceny and armed robbery is often tied in to drug addiction, in that an addict, to support his habit, will engage in crime as a source of income—it may cost him as much as \$100 a day to buy drugs. This may mean stealing \$500 in goods, which, when sold to a middleman, usually called the "fence," will net the criminal about \$100.

There is a need for a broad, cooperative attack on this problem, coordinating not only all levels of government, but also schools, churches, civic clubs, and parents to help find answers to a growing American dilemma.

Young people need our help—not our condemnation—in this problem.

CALL FOR AN IMMEDIATE CEASE-FIRE IN VIETNAM

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, last night I delivered a speech before the Jaycees in New York City on the subject of an immediate cease-fire in Vietnam and a reinterpretation of the existing legislation covering conscientious objection so as to include the selective conscientious objector. I am including the speech at this point in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY MR. KOCH

Ladies and gentlemen: I particularly welcome this opportunity to speak tonight to a group such as yours, composed as it is of individuals who are not too old to have forgotten the stresses and strains of youth and not too young to realize that there are at least a few difficulties confronting other generations; and I have chosen as my topic one which I think is uniquely suitable for consideration at this time by your organization.

I don't have to tell you that we live in troubled times. In New York City, it seems as if even the weather has turned bitterly against us. But our major problems in this city and throughout the nation can hardly be blamed on nature.

Once again, in recent days, the deepest ferment is on college campuses of the country. I am sure that all of us have become somewhat hardened to news of student demonstrations at Berkeley and at San Francisco State College, and, I suppose, we are not greatly surprised by similar activities at a big city college, such as CCNY, or at a university with the maverick traditions of Wisconsin. I doubt, however, that many of us expected riots to take place at a traditional Southern school like Duke.

And, mind you, all of these activities of which I speak are not taking place in the spring, when, it might be said, a young man's fancy perennially turns to love—or its opposite; they are occurring in the middle of winter. And they appear to be more violent than ever before.

What's it all about? I certainly don't have the answer, and I don't think there is one solution to the many problems that erupt in the form of student demonstrations, but I do believe I have some facts and figures to support the specific proposals I shall place before you tonight.

I am aware that the avowed aim of the most recent student demonstrations has been a separate department of Negro, black or Afro-American studies to be governed by the black students themselves, and I accept that

aim as a sincere one, without going into the merits of it at this time. But I don't believe it accounts fully for the fury with which it has been espoused by black or white students. That fury, or much of it, I submit, is directly traceable to another constant pressure on the nervous system of the young people of this country—the war in Vietnam.

Let me take you back just a bit in the history of student demonstrations, to the "Daddy" of them all, which set the pattern for the current ones—last spring's "strike" at Columbia University. You no doubt remember that the issues at Columbia were the association of the University with I. D. A., the Institute for Defense Analyses, and the construction of a new University in a portion of Harlem's Morningside Heights Park. What you may have forgotten is that President Johnson had, not too long prior to the strike, announced the termination of draft deferments based on attendance at graduate school. To students opposed to the war there was suddenly no way out.

The Cox Commission Report on the Columbia Strike has this to say on the subject, and I quote:

"The Vietnam war is the overriding concern of nearly all students. For them it is a matter of life or death—to kill or be killed. For many, it is an immoral war and all who support it are immoral; it should be stopped at once—how stopped is a detail irrelevant to men of commitment."

So much for the concerns of the student at Columbia. Even more in point are the observations of Dean Truman, the gentleman who was one of the main human objects of student wrath. In his testimony before the Cox Commission, Dr. Truman said this:

"Some of us have felt for a very long time that if it were inescapable that the current war in Vietnam had to continue on, it was debatable whether university communities could survive, because the tension is not only among students but in faculties, and the whole fabric of the institution is strained. (I continue to quote). In a sense there have been two battlefields in the war. One in Vietnam and the other in our university campuses. And they are not good places for battlefields."

Thus spoke, not Mark Rudd, but Dr. Truman.

"And they are not good places for battlefields." Those words were spoken last summer, but they are even more relevant today.

Because of the somewhat flickering spotlight on the negotiations in Paris, I fear that we have tended recently to forget that there remains a battlefield in Vietnam, that the war there is far from over. Of course, it is not, and the terrible consequences of that fact may be brought into focus by a few statistics.

From March 31, 1968, when President Johnson announced a limited cessation of the bombing in North Vietnam, to this past January 25th, there have been no less than 10,290 American soldiers killed in Vietnam.

Since January 1, 1969, a month and a half ago, 567 American boys have been killed in the war, 1,766 have been wounded severely enough to require hospitalization, and another 2,476 have been wounded without needing hospitalization.

I might as well give the whole sad story. In the nine years in which the war in Vietnam has dragged on—31,181 Americans dead; 101,533 wounded and hospitalized; and another 95,272 wounded but not hospitalized.

And the killing and the wounding and the destruction goes on. Our nation is now committed to peace in Vietnam. Our new President has stated that the liquidation of the war there has top priority in the business of his administration. Nevertheless, the killing, wounding and destruction continues. In my mind—and I do not claim to be a great moral philosopher or a military or foreign

affairs expert—there is a touch of insanity in this situation.

David Schoenbrun, the news correspondent and author, who does qualify as an expert on Vietnam, in a speech in Chicago last week before a group of business executives, stated his belief that President Nixon would have the war in Vietnam just about ended by this coming June. My comment on that is—"Great! I'm all for it, and I am more than willing to believe at this time that the President can and will do whatever can be done by him to achieve that goal." At least, I intend to hold him to Mr. Schoenbrun's promise!

But I have one or two suggestions for President Nixon for immediate action, even before, hopefully, he ends the war in June.

I did not intend my first suggestion to be the main topic of my speech tonight, and it will not be. After reading the most recent casualty figures, however, I felt obliged to say a brief word on the subject.

I think the time has come for a permanent cease-fire in Vietnam—now, immediately.

We have stopped the bombing of North Vietnam. Now let us stop the killing and the wounding and the destruction in all Vietnam.

The time is ripe. This is the Tet season, the Viet Lunar New Year's Holiday; and the Viet Cong has unilaterally proclaimed a temporary cease-fire for seven days, beginning this past Sunday, if the Cong observes that cease-fire, I can conceive of no good reason why the military forces of South Vietnam and the United States should not honor, and why if so honored, it cannot be extended indefinitely.

Unfortunately, President Nixon has indicated that he thinks otherwise. In his very first public press conference at the end of last month, he gave his opinion that a cease-fire has no "relevance" to the situation in Vietnam. He did not go into the subject very deeply, but he had quite obviously accepted the reasoning of one of his chief advisers on such matters, Professor Henry Kissinger. In the current issue of *Foreign Affairs Quarterly*, in an article devoted exclusively to the Vietnam negotiations, Professor Kissinger, argues against an immediate cease-fire in Vietnam by contrasting the situation there to the situation in Korea. In brief, the Professor says it is very difficult and potentially dangerous to have a cease-fire in a guerrilla war, where there is not a single, more or less continuous battle-front.

Perhaps it is difficult and dangerous, and I do not propose to try to answer Professor Kissinger's argument in detail, but I do wish to remind you of an analogous situation which will serve to make my point.

Not too long ago, in the course of the same war in Vietnam, we were told by experts that it would be difficult and dangerous to stop the bombing of North Vietnam without jeopardizing the lives of our soldiers in the South and perhaps risking the outcome of the entire war. And because of our refusal to stop the bombing of the North, we held up the beginning of the real negotiations in Paris for many months. Then, suddenly, a few days before the general election in this country last November, at a time hardly dictated by the military or political situation in Vietnam, President Johnson stopped the bombing of the North—and what happened? Have we suffered military reverses as a result of that action? On the contrary, all reports indicate that our forces have been doing very well. As a matter of fact, our ground forces have increased their search and destroy missions and thereby put into doubt our alleged new policy of abandonment of the goal of a military solution in Vietnam.

You don't have to be an expert to know that continuation of armed combat while negotiations for peace are pending constitutes a constant impediment to those negotiations, if not a serious threat to their ulti-

mate success. And so I suggest to Professor Kissinger and to President Nixon that an immediate cease-fire in Vietnam is more than relevant and less than impossible. It is the next logical step on the road to peace and domestic tranquillity. Certainly there are risks, but every action in pursuit of war or peace involves risks—better to take them in pursuit of peace.

My second proposal, and the main topic of my remarks tonight, is really an extension of the first, although it is of a more long-range nature. An immediate cease-fire will bring an end to the killing, which as the Cox Commission Report noted, has been disturbing the minds of our college students—and, I don't doubt, the minds of many other young people. To die in a war to which you are opposed is bad enough. To die in such a war while negotiations for peace are pending is insane.

But it is with the living that we are most concerned: those who have heretofore opposed the war out of conscience and those who are opposed to this war and who have not yet been called to service.

In a letter I sent to President Nixon very recently, I suggested that he take immediate action to grant exemption from military service to young men who are conscientiously opposed to the war in Vietnam. As a corollary to that proposal, I suggested that those young men who have been convicted of draft evasion and those who have left the country to avoid conscription should, as soon as possible, be given the chance to regain their freedom or to return with impunity from their self-imposed exile, as the case may be, by proving before a duly authorized tribunal that they acted as they did because of conscientious objection to the war in Vietnam.

I am referring to what has become known as "selective conscientious objection," the right or privilege of a citizen to claim and receive exemption from military service during a particular war because of his opposition to that war on religious, ethical or moral grounds, even though he is not opposed to all war on such grounds. Of course, those exempted from military service on the basis of selective conscientious objection would be required to perform an acceptable alternative service for the country, in the same way that those exempted from military service on the basis of general conscientious objection are required to do so today.

There is, I submit, an element of timeliness here, too. The President has just taken an important step in recognition of the validity to the arguments against enforced military service by requesting the Defense Department to develop plans for the establishment of a voluntary army as soon as circumstances permit. If it is fair and reasonable and practicable to give a young man a choice whether or not to enter the military service at any time, why isn't it a step in the right direction to allow him to refuse to enter military service because of conscientious objection to a particular war?

And why, under such circumstances, keep in jail or in exile those young men who are there now because of conscientious objection to the war in Vietnam?

Mind you, in this last report, I am talking only about men of true conscience, who because of their moral opposition to the current war, have been willing to go to jail under severe sentences or to live indefinitely away from their family, friends and countrymen. Whether we agree with them or not, there are brave and dedicated human beings. They are at the core of the moral opposition to the war in Vietnam. And let's face it, there has been and is now tremendous opposition to that war in this country, not to mention the rest of the world. It has been, and hopefully will forever be, the most unpopular war in American history.

Here, then, is a splendid opportunity for the President to begin to bind up some of

the wounds caused by that war internally, within this country. Here is a way for Mr. Nixon to "cool it," to reduce the tensions afflicting our young people before they grow worse.

You may have read Tom Wicker's column in the *New York Times* of last Thursday, but in case you have not and you can get a copy of it, I recommend it to you. In that column, Mr. Wicker says the following about amnesty to those in jail and in exile because of their opposition to the war in Vietnam. (Before I quote from the Wicker column, I ask you to bear in mind the fact that Wicker is writing about automatic amnesty, which is substantially broader than my proposal.) This is the quote:

"There is an issue which plainly is going to have to be dealt with in Washington—not just because movers and shakers like Bill Coffin (the Chaplain at Yale, to whom Wicker had referred earlier in his column)—not just because movers and shakers like Bill Coffin are involved but because discussion with the student generation, at Yale and elsewhere, suggests that amnesty is as genuinely an issue of concern now as have been the draft itself and the war."

Selective conscientious objection and the form of amnesty I propose, which will be based on proof of such objection, is a logical practical extension of the more general type of conscientious objection long recognized in this country and in other democratic countries. It must stem from deep-rooted religious, ethical or moral conviction—not from mere political beliefs, and certainly not from individual physical, mental, emotional or financial considerations.

It is not surprising, therefore, that it has come to be supported by the leaders and leading organizations of major religious denominations in this country. Shortly before his tragic death, the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr. said that "Every young man who believes (the Vietnam) war is abominable and unjust should file as a conscientious objector." The late Father John Courtney Murray took a similar position. He said quote:

"We all owe some debt of gratitude to those who, by raising the issue of selective conscientious objection, have undertaken to transform the tragic conflict in South Vietnam into an issue not simply of political decision and military strategy, but of moral judgment as well."

Delegates to the World Council of Churches voted almost unanimously last year, quote, "the churches should give spiritual care and support . . . to those who, especially in the light of the nature of modern warfare, object to participation in particular wars they feel bound by conscience to oppose." (Unquote) In a recent pastoral statement, the National Council of Catholic Bishops of the United States recommended that consideration be given those whose "reasons of conscience are more personal and specific" than "total rejection of military force." (unquote) And also recently, the Governing Council of the American Jewish Congress adopted a resolution expressly stating that they (quote) "support exemption from military service in a particular war for those whose religious, ethical or moral principles compel them to object to participation in that war."

What is a surprise in the history of selective conscientious objection is that Great Britain in 1940, in the darkest hours of World War II, added to the everlasting glory which she achieved at that time, by recognizing selective claims of conscience. Can we do less in this country today?

The President of the United States has the powers to do what I now propose. Legal experts have advised me that the Federal statute governing the law of conscientious objection in this country can properly be construed to include selective conscientious

objection, and several Federal district courts have so construed it. Based on that construction, all that the President need do is to order the Director of the Selective Service System to promulgate regulations granting exemption from military service on the basis of selective conscientious objection.

If the President declines to issue such an order, Congress certainly has the power to amend the governing statute, and I am prepared to introduce a bill to that effect or to join with other members of the House of Representatives in doing so. It does seem to me, however, that, particularly at this time in the history of our country, and particularly at this moment in the administration of our new President, executive action would be more appropriate, more expeditious and effective and more beneficial to the country.

There is, of course, no question, that the President has the power, and customarily is the sole exponent of the power, to grant amnesty to Federal prisoners. And I am indebted to Tom Wicker for bringing to my attention, in the article I quoted from a moment ago, some of the historical precedents for the exercise of that power.

The very first President of the United States, George Washington, granted amnesty to the Pennsylvania farmers who staged the Whiskey Rebellion. President Johnson (Andrew, that is) offered the most famous amnesty, in 1868, to Southerners who had fought for the Confederacy in the Civil War. More recently, in another country, but one whose traditions are similar enough to our own to make the actions of its chief executive pertinent in this discussion, President Charles de Gaulle gave amnesty to many who had conspired against the French government on the issue of Algerian independence.

Again, I point out that the amnesty I propose will not be an automatic amnesty. It will be conditional on proof that the claimant is one who could have established his right to exemption from military service based on selective conscientious objection, had that right been available to him before he was sent to jail or went into exile.

How would it work, as a practical matter? How can it possibly be determined whether a claimant for exemption for the draft or for amnesty is entitled to the same on the basis of selective conscientious objection? Please don't be put off by such questions. It is clearly as easy to determine a claim of opposition to a particular war on religious, ethical or moral grounds as it is to determine a claim of opposition to all war on such grounds, and our Selective Service System and courts have been doing the latter for many years now. As a lawyer, I would venture to say it's easier to determine a claim of selective conscientious objection since I find that general principles have no meaning except as they apply to specific cases.

Take for example, the stock question employed today to defeat the claims of those who seek exemption from the draft on the basis of conscientious objection: Would you have felt the same way if you had been called up for military service in World War II? A negative answer to that question results in rejection of the claim for exemption today, provided the claimant is honest enough not to answer affirmatively. If exemption or amnesty were allowed on the basis of selective conscientious objection, one, and I think only one, more question would be required after a negative answer. Why would you not have felt the same way in World War II? It seems to me that the answer to that second question, honest or dishonest, would fairly quickly serve to establish whether or not a claim for exemption or amnesty based on selective conscientious objection was truly rooted in religious, ethical or moral conviction.

Nor need you fear that such claims, if allowed, would flood the Selective Service System and the courts. The history of claims for exemption based on general conscientious

objection indicates the contrary, and most of us have had some experience in this respect. We know that the young man is a rare exception who chooses to undergo the rigors of the procedure required to be followed to obtain such exemption if he does not truly believe himself to be a conscientious objector. I don't see why it would be different if claims for exemption and amnesty were allowed on the basis of selective conscientious objection.

I go one step further. If it should prove to be otherwise. If the Selective Service System and our courts were flooded with claims based on opposition to a particular war, wouldn't that be a signal to all of us that we had better reappraise our participation in that war? And, lastly, whatever our decision in connection with any such reappraisal, wouldn't it be better to have our young men challenging that war, or at least their enforced participation in it, in an orderly procedure before a duly constituted tribunal rather than in a violent and destructive demonstration on a college campus or in a city square?

There has been much talk of "cooling it." President Nixon has received some support in the belief or the hope that he might be able to do just that. And a new administration always has a breathing spell because of the patience which even its opponents are required to exhibit toward it for a brief period of time. But no one, not even a newly elected President can "cool it" with words alone for any substantial period. There must be action to back up his words. In a country weary of an unpopular war, many of whose young people seem to have abandoned hope of ending that war or achieving much else through the orderly processes of government, some firm step must be taken to liquidate the war and to encourage youth to believe that their voices will at least be heard and their just grievances redressed by those in authority.

I suggest to you that an immediate ceasefire in the war in Vietnam and immediate action to institute a procedure for exemption from military service and for amnesty based on conscientious objection to that war represent the type of action that is necessary.

KNOX COUNTY, IND., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IMPLEMENTS PROGRAM FOR RECOGNIZING HONESTY

(Mr. ZION asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, the Knox County, Ind., Chamber of Commerce believes that our national crime wave is a result of indifference at the local community level. They are implementing a program for recognizing honesty by designing and presenting an "Honest Abe" award to those people exhibiting the qualities of "Honest Abe."

The chamber of commerce launched its program with this resolution:

RESOLUTION BY KNOX COUNTY, IND., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Theodore Roosevelt said: "Our first duty is to war against dishonesty—war against it in public life, and war against it in business life. Corruption in every form is the arch enemy of this Republic, the arch enemy of free institutions and a government by the people, and even more dangerous than the open lawlessness of violence, because it works in hidden and furtive fashion."

With this thought in mind, the board of directors of the Knox County Chamber of Commerce, after extended discussion and study considers it their duty to their com-

munity, state, and nation, to express a grave concern for the apparent slackness on the part of citizens of this and other communities in demanding honesty from their contemporaries, community leaders, and elected and appointed officials. The board of directors of the Knox County Chamber of Commerce requests and urges:

That every citizen of Knox County become personally involved in perpetuating the principles of good citizenship by:

a. rededicating him/her self to their solemn duty to abide by and support the laws of the land both written and implied.

b. uniting with fellow citizens of Knox County in standing firm against that which is illegal and/or immoral.

c. working with our elected and appointed officials in fighting crime wherever it is found.

Further: That every elected and appointed official responsible for investigation, apprehension, and prosecution of law violators be assured of public support and a personal interest in the prevalence of justice.

Further: That every organization, club, fraternity, or sorority consider adopting a positive program to encourage participation in the governmental process with special emphasis on honesty and justice in order to perpetuate the principles and ideals upon which America is founded.

Further: That resolutions and petitions pledging interest and support of law enforcement and swift dispensation of justice be presented to elected and appointed officials.

Further: That public statements be made joining the members of the Knox County Chamber of Commerce in affirming their belief that law and order begins with and rests upon a solid citizenry dedicated to the elimination of crime regardless of the stature of the person or persons committing a violation of the law.

D. D. MEYER,
President.

Attested:

JOSEPH C. LACKEY,
Executive Vice President.

Adopted this 12th day of February 1969 by the Board of Directors, Knox County Chamber of Commerce.

FARMERS GRAIN AND SOYBEAN RESERVE ACT OF 1969, H.R. 7004

(Mr. KLEPPE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced the Farmers Grain and Soybean Reserve Act of 1969, H.R. 7004.

This legislation would lock up, in the hands of farmers, 300 million bushels of wheat, 500 million bushels of feed grains, and 75 million bushels of soybeans.

With net farm income down and with farm operating costs moving higher, immediate action is needed to bolster farm prices. Enactment of the Farmers Grain and Soybean Reserve Act of 1969 would give farmers not only immediate income assistance but new hope for the future.

The American farm economy is in serious trouble. Net realized farm income in 1966 was \$16.2 billion; in 1967, \$14.2 billion, and in 1968, \$14.9 billion. By way of comparison, total farm production expenses amounted to \$33.4 billion in 1966; \$34.8 billion in 1967, and \$35.9 billion in 1968. Thus, total drop in realized net income during that period was \$3.3 billion. The total increase in farm production expense during the same time period was \$3.9 billion. It is costing the farmer more and more to make less and less.

Mr. Speaker, in North Dakota's Second District, which I represent, wheat is the kingpin of the agricultural economy. And, in terms of constant dollars the price of wheat is lower today than at any time since the depression-ridden 1930's. North Dakota is the Nation's leading producer of Hard Spring and Durum wheat. The business barometer in my district rises and falls with the price of wheat. For some time now, it has been recording "stormy weather."

Apart from the much-needed lift which a strong strategic reserve bill would give to the commodity markets, I believe a sizable stockpile is clearly in the national interest. It would provide insurance against a domestic crop failure or serious disaster. It would enable the United States to meet emergency needs which might arise in friendly countries.

This legislation is aimed at strengthening farm prices by effectively insulating present surpluses from the marketplace. It provides that when farmers are called upon to make delivery of grains they hold in storage under the reserve program, the Secretary of Agriculture may not offer them for sale at less than 100 percent of parity.

This bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into agreements with producers to place wheat, feed grains and soybeans in store, under their control, until needed to meet free market shortages or emergency situations. Commodity Credit Corporation would pay storage charges. There would be no interest charge to farmers participating in the program.

Loans on the stored commodities would be at 115 percent of the present support rate. For wheat, this would be \$1.44 per bushel; for corn, \$1.21; for soybeans, \$2.87.

There is a strict formula governing termination of the contracts. Should the carryover of wheat drop to 15 percent of annual requirements, feed grains to 10 percent, or soybeans to 5 percent, the Secretary would be authorized to terminate enough of the emergency contracts to replenish the free market supply by 5 percent in the case of wheat and feed grains and 3 percent in the case of soybeans.

To illustrate: If annual requirements for wheat totaled 1.4 billion bushels and free stocks fell below 210 million, the Secretary could issue a 60-day call for termination of contracts on 70 million bushels in the reserve stocks. Producers would then commence paying interest and storage charges on the wheat which had been called. They would have the option of selling the wheat and repaying the loan or continuing to hold it at their own expense. They would have 1 year to sell and settle or deliver the collateral.

This time element would give producers additional bargaining power to achieve higher prices. The 100 percent of parity resale restriction would prevent USDA from dumping any grains or soybeans which might be delivered by farmers.

Producers would have the option of terminating their contracts upon notice given not less than 60 days before the beginning of the new marketing year.

Rotation of stocks in the reserve to maintain good condition is authorized.

If this Congress undertakes a reserve program, however, every effort must be made to insure that what we are creating is a strategic reserve in fact, not just in name. It is my conviction that it would be better to have no reserve at all than one which would permit stockpiled commodities to be shoveled out of the back door almost as fast as they were being moved into the warehouses.

As a member of the Livestock and Grains Subcommittee of the House Agriculture Committee, I attended extensive hearings on grain reserve legislation 2 years ago. The consensus seems to be that a reserve program is desirable only if it contains safeguards which would effectively insulate the stockpiled commodities from the marketplace.

Under whatever name we seek to set aside a supply of wheat or any other commodity, there remains the cold, hard fact that it still exists. It is a greater potential threat to market prices than a similar quantity of grain in the hands of the private trade. We had a massive dumping program of corn a few years ago. Farmers would not want to see it repeated.

Commodity Credit Corporation currently holds in its uncommitted inventory 102,779 million bushels of wheat, 259,409 million bushels of corn, and 52,132 million bushels of soybeans. For wheat and corn these are minimal inventories, when compared with those of some recent years. And they are now being withheld from sale for unrestricted use. They still pose some threat to the market—because neither the farmer nor the grain trade can ever know for sure what CCC sales policy will be in the future. This uncertainty would be deepened if CCC held a sizable reserve inventory which could be fed back into the marketplace at the first faint sign of a price increase.

Some of the grain reserve legislation before the last Congress did not contain adequate safeguards against future dumping. Nevertheless, I believe an effective reserve bill can be designed. I think the bill I have introduced is basically sound. Under the provisions of this legislation, when farmers are called upon to make delivery of the stored commodities, the Secretary of Agriculture may not offer these grains and soybeans for sale at less than 100 percent of parity.

I regard the quantities of grain and soybeans specified in my bill as minimum figures. Perhaps a larger reserve is needed to meet possible future needs and to help increase prices of these commodities to the desired levels.

This legislation is identical with the bill I introduced in the 90th Congress, and I have had an opportunity to discuss it with a large number of farmers and grain men. I can report that there is broad interest in a grain reserve program. I urge early consideration of this legislation by the 91st Congress.

LONGSHORE STRIKE INCLUDING PORT OF PHILADELPHIA CAUSES CONSIDERABLE ECONOMIC LOSS

(Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am gravely concerned about the current longshore strike within the Port of Philadelphia as this is located in the Third Congressional District which I represent. The strike has not only caused a very considerable economic loss, both to the employers and the employees directly involved, but it is also directly responsible for the closing down of many businesses and loss of employment in areas other than the immediate dockside.

I have reviewed the situation very carefully, and I find the following:

The negotiations began in New York and were attended by representatives of the unions from all of the ports, including the Port of Philadelphia, on the one hand, and by representatives of companies which constitute the largest part of the membership of the Philadelphia Marine Trade Association, and whose principal offices are located in New York. A national contract was finally worked out between these groups and thereupon the ports outside of New York, including the Port of Philadelphia, undertook to negotiate their individual contracts on local conditions.

In the Port of Philadelphia, the employers refused to recognize the results of the negotiations in New York, particularly with respect to the vacation benefits for the fifth and sixth weeks, the containerization plan, and the guaranteed annual wage. Much time was needlessly wasted in the negotiation of these items, and they still have not been concluded. In addition to the national issues worked out between the parties, certain local issues also have been the subject of hectic bargaining. One of these is the so-called setback clause, which enables an employer who has hired longshoremen the day before employment is to begin to setback these men from an 8 o'clock start to a 1 o'clock start with only a 1-hour guarantee instead of the 4-hour guarantee otherwise provided in the contract. This clause has been an especially touchy one with the longshoremen because it is so frequently invoked. An examination of the record shows that this clause has been abusively invoked. When it was first invoked, it was on account of inclement weather, and the employers granted the 1-hour guarantee, whereas the inclement weather clause in the contract provides for a 4-hour guarantee. The arbitrator, it seems clear, erroneously interpreted the agreement to ignore the inclement weather clause and every other clause in the agreement except the setback clause in reaching his conclusions. It appears clear that the complaint of the longshoremen in this regard is fully justified.

As the situation now stands, there are several issues on the table. First is the vacation clause for the fifth and sixth weeks, where the employers seek to change the eligibility provisions for these 2 weeks from what they are in New York. In New York, eligibility for the fourth week determines the eligibility for the fifth and sixth weeks. Here, the employers are trying to increase the number of eligibility hours from 1,500 for the fourth week to 1,700 hours for the fifth

week and 1,800 hours for the sixth week. This would disqualify the vast number of longshoremen in the unit from the benefit of the fifth and sixth weeks and, therefore, make the fifth and sixth weeks only a mirage in the desert.

In New York, the guaranteed annual wage has been fixed at 2,080 hours, from 1,600 hours. In Philadelphia, the guaranteed annual wage was 1,500 hours, and the employers here seek to reduce the 2,080 hours which was won in New York to 1,800 hours.

The setback clause is also an issue, and the union also seeks a guarantee of 5½ million hours into the pension and welfare funds. This appears to be a reasonable demand on the part of the union since in the last 4 years the number of hours worked in the port exceeded that figure. For example, in 1965, the number of hours was 5,616,321; in 1966, it was 5,833,455; in 1967, it was 5,687,037; in 1968, it was 5,900,000. Thus, it appears that the number of hours is gradually increasing over the years, and that the figure of 5½ million hours is a conservative and reasonable one.

In order to reach an agreement with the employers, the union made a sacrifice and agreed to accept the reduction in the guaranteed annual income from 2,080 to 1,800, on condition that the employers accept the union's position regarding the eligibility benefits for the fifth and sixth weeks' vacation and the abolition of the setback clause. I regard this as a very substantial sacrifice by the union, which should have been sufficient to settle the issues. Notwithstanding this, the employers simply accepted the reduction from 2,080 to 1,800 hours and proceeded to bargain on the fifth and sixth weeks' vacation and the setback clause as though the union had agreed to voluntarily reduce, without conditioning the reduction on the other two clauses. Negotiations have continued, and the employers continue to withhold approval of the fifth and sixth weeks' vacation on existing eligibility requirements and continue to hold out for the setback clause.

Extending my inquiry into other ports, I find that the ports of Boston, Baltimore, Hampton Roads, and others, are deadlocked on various issues, and it seems that the Philadelphia employers are prolonging these negotiations in the hopes of nullifying the gains made by the longshoremen in the prior negotiations conducted in New York, between the identical parties, notwithstanding that the PMTA, at least outwardly, stated that they would not be bound by the results of that negotiation.

It is my opinion that the proposal made by the longshoremen reducing the guaranteed annual income from 2,080 to 1,800 hours on condition that the eligibility requirements for the fourth week apply to the fifth and sixth weeks of vacation and that the setback clause be eliminated from the contract was a most reasonable proposal and should have been accepted by the employers. Their failure to do so indicates that they are not bargaining in good faith.

I consider that the union's proposal reducing the guaranteed annual income from 2,080 hours to 1,800 hours on con-

dition that the employers agree to the eligibility benefits applicable to the fourth week be applied to the fifth and sixth weeks and that the setback clause be eliminated from the contract is an extremely fair and reasonable one and should be adopted by the employers. I also recommend that the union's demand for payment into the pension and welfare funds on the basis of 5½ million man-hours is a most reasonable one and likewise should be adopted. These, in my opinion, are equitable solutions to the dispute. I hope that the foregoing will serve to resolve the Philadelphia dispute so that the strike may be ended and commerce resumed in the Port of Philadelphia.

TRIBUTE TO CONGRESSMAN ROBERT A. EVERETT—EIGHTH DISTRICT, TENNESSEE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) for 60 minutes.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a brief period of time of tribute has been set aside today to afford us the opportunity of eulogizing and honoring our beloved friend and late colleague, Congressman ROBERT A. "FATS" EVERETT of the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee.

"FATS" EVERETT passed away on January 26 last in the Veterans Administration Hospital in Nashville.

He had been ill for some time but he had mustered the strength to return to Washington for the 91st Congress.

This was the last great effort of this dedicated and determined public servant.

After a brief period in Washington he was compelled by his worsening condition, to return to the hospital.

Even in the hospital and through the day before he passed away in the night, he conferred frequently with his office on important matters to assist the people in his beloved district and State of Tennessee.

He literally lived for his district and Tennessee.

He labored day and night for the people who sought his assistance, and for the general growth and progress of the Eighth District, the State, and the Nation.

ROBERT ASHTON EVERETT insisted on being called by his nickname, "Fats."

He was a big man, a tower of strength.

Yet he was humble and earthy, a man of the people who sensed their needs and understood their problems.

He was loved by the people of Tennessee.

ROBERT EVERETT was truly a man among men—a giant—not only physically but in his dedication—his legislative ability—and his devotion to his people.

"FATS" EVERETT possessed a wit and humor that unfailingly lightened and brightened the day.

His friends frequently referred to him as the heavy man with the light touch.

"FATS" EVERETT's magnificent sense of humor will give added dimension to the legend of this Paul Bunyan of Tennessee political life.

He rendered great service to our veterans as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

This Nation now has the greatest program of veterans benefits of any country, and "Fats" EVERETT sponsored and championed much veterans legislation.

"FATS" EVERETT will also be remembered for his distinguished record of service on the Committee on Public Works.

Many of the great internal improvements of our time were vigorously supported by "FATS" EVERETT because he cared about his country and his beloved State of Tennessee.

I was privileged to attend the funeral services at Union City, his hometown, along with all members of the Tennessee delegation and other colleagues including Senator ALBERT GORE and Senator HOWARD BAKER, and Gov. Buford Ellington, of Tennessee.

Other close friends of "FATS" who attended included Representative OLIN TEAGUE, of Texas; Representative ROBERT E. JONES, JR., of Alabama; Representative FRANK STUBBLEFIELD, of Kentucky; Representative JOHN M. SLACK, of West Virginia; and Representative WILLIAM L. HUNGATE, of Missouri.

The church filled to overflowing—the many friends unable to get inside the church—the many beautiful flowers—all gave silent testimony to the fact that this man was beloved by his people.

"FATS" EVERETT was born in Obion County, Tenn., February 25, 1915.

He was reared on a farm and attended public schools in the county.

He was graduated from Murray State Teachers College in Kentucky in 1936.

He had an illustrious career of public service.

In 1936 he was elected to Obion County court.

In 1938 at the age of 23 he became the Nation's youngest county circuit court clerk.

Following 31 months of service in the Army in World War II, he became administrative assistant to U.S. Senator Tom Stewart of Tennessee.

Later he held the same position with Gov. Gordon Browning of Tennessee.

Later he served as executive secretary of the Tennessee County Services Association.

On February 1, 1958, he succeeded our late colleague Jere Cooper in the House.

"FATS" EVERETT's good humor and warm greetings no longer echo down the corridors of the Capitol.

We shall miss his warm greetings—the pat on the back—his deep booming reassurances of friendship—his hearty laugh—the joyful noise that always preceded him.

He brought happiness to many people—through his humor and through his service.

"FATS" EVERETT will never be forgotten as long as any of his friends walk this earth.

He will live in the hearts and lives of his colleagues and his countrymen.

I know that I express the feeling of our colleagues and friends when I say that we are pleased that he walked our way and shared our life.

We are all richly blessed to have had him as our colleague and friend.

I want also to take this means of joining with others in extending to his mother to whom he was devoted, and other members of the family this expression of my deepest sympathy in their loss and bereavement.

In the words of the Reverend Scott Johnson at the funeral service:

The one we honor lived a useful, devoted, unselfish life. The world has been made better for his having lived. Surely the congratulatory hand of life's all-wise Judge reaches out to the accompaniment of, "Well done" . . .

For "FATS" life's gavel has struck its final adjournment.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ALBERT).

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join my distinguished colleague from Tennessee in expressing deep personal sorrow over the death of ROBERT A. EVERETT, whom we affectionately knew as "FATS."

"FATS" EVERETT was one of the friendliest men I have ever known and he was during all of his years in this House a very devoted friend of mine.

I know that, like myself, every Member missed "FATS" during his period of illness.

He was back with us for only a few days during the opening of this Congress.

His personality added a unique flavor to this body.

His huge frame, his strong and friendly voice, his quick wit and flashing eyes, his kindly disposition were characteristics that he alone possessed in such abundance.

"FATS" loved the House and he loved life.

He was a man of broad interests.

He loved the rural America from which he came.

He had a great variety of hobbies and interests.

For instance, he was a rodeo fan.

Every year in September, over many years, he visited me in my hometown of McAlester, and attended with me the Oklahoma Prison Rodeo.

He knew many of the great rodeo artists of the country by their first names and they all were extremely fond of him.

Beneath the refreshing humor of "FATS" EVERETT ran a deep and abiding desire to help solve the great problems of our time.

He loved his country.

He believed in its destiny.

He was a serious student of legislation.

He was knowledgeable in many fields.

He was a dedicated and hard-working member of two great committees where he served our Nation's veterans and looked after our country's vital public works project.

He was a great American and a very outstanding Member of this House.

"FATS" was devoted to his wonderful mother and she to him.

No sorrow is so deep or tender as the sorrow of a mother who must give up her child.

Nothing can completely allay that sor-

row, but Mrs. Everett in this hour of sadness can be sure that she has the thoughts and the prayers of every Member of this body.

May God give her the strength to endure her great loss and comfort all those who were privileged to know and love her son.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WHITTEN).

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, surely we all lost a friend in the untimely death of the late ROBERT A. "FATS" EVERETT.

It is indeed difficult to put into words the feelings that we all have for our friend. Truly he was one of the fine people of the world—friendly, always willing and active in the welfare of the people of his district, of his State, and of his Nation. To know him was to love him and, throughout the years of his life I do not believe anyone could have set a finer example of a public servant whether in or out of office. It was "FATS" natural disposition. His contribution to this Nation will live for years to come in the public works improvements that he worked so hard to bring about.

I join here with my friends in the words that have been said, which I have not tried to repeat. I do join with them in extending to his beloved mother and to his relatives our deepest sympathy in their bereavement. We have truly lost one of our greatest Members.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, when I walked to my office on Sunday, January 26 and saw the flag at half mast, I thought at once of our friend and colleague, the Honorable ROBERT A. EVERETT because I had known how poor his health was and how silently he had suffered. The policeman on the door told me that our colleague had left us. I knew that his passing would be felt by all who knew him and that everyone who had had the opportunity to be acquainted with him would miss that hearty laugh and booming voice. I was sad and felt the personal loss of a good friend.

Congressman EVERETT served his district and his State well. He was an effective legislator. It was my privilege to sit with him on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs where he was conscientious and able in his performance. He was a true friend of veterans of all wars.

During the time he served in the Congress, I doubt that any Member who had the opportunity to talk with him ever found him to be other than cheerful and willing to help anyone in any way he could. Certainly "FATS" EVERETT, as he was affectionately known, never met a stranger.

Our lives were enriched by his presence and personality. We have lost a great friend and a happy spirit.

To his mother, his many friends, and to his constituents, I express my deepest sympathy.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to my

distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. BLANTON).

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, if I had to choose only one of the many pleasurable events which have happened to me during my tenure in Congress, I would have to say that the opportunity to know and work with some of the greatest Americans of our time is one experience which stands out in my mind.

The comradeship, the working together to help move this great Nation and great people forward, truly these have been a profound influence on my life.

When one of our number no longer walks among us, it saddens us all. And today, we are saddened, not only at the loss of a friend, a coworker, a member of our group—but by the loss of a dedicated American who has served his country well.

I speak of the Honorable ROBERT EVERETT, a Member of this body for 10 years, and one of the finest legislators Tennessee has ever sent to Congress.

The many thousands of west Tennesseans who knew Congressman EVERETT simply as "FATS," have lost one of the most effective and influential friends it has produced in many a generation. And I know I speak for all the Tennessee delegation, in saying that Tennessee has lost one of its truly efficient public servants in many decades.

"FATS" EVERETT considered this Hall his home—and his constituents as his adopted family. He lived his life in service to both, and perhaps no legislator loved his work more than he.

My district shares its border with the one of my late colleague and friend. Our people are bound by bonds of common heritage, geography and interests. Perhaps that is one reason I knew "FATS" EVERETT so well, and why he endeavored to help me adjust to this new experience as a Congressman when I first came to Washington in 1967. I am forever indebted for his helping hand, and much richer for his friendship.

No eloquent eulogy, no detailed review of his monumental achievements both here and in Tennessee, can truly reflect the sadness we all feel at his untimely passing.

Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to respectfully pay tribute to Congressman ROBERT A. "FATS" EVERETT, whose untimely death January 26, has left a sorrowful void in these Halls of Congress. He was loved, respected, and esteemed by his colleagues, his constituents, his family, and friends. He was indeed a friend to all, and this tragic loss will be shared by all.

I respectfully request that the eulogy delivered at the funeral rites of Representative ROBERT A. EVERETT by the Reverend Scott Johnson, of Union City, Tenn., be incorporated into the proceedings of the House of Representatives this day, February 19, 1969. It is my feeling that this message so aptly portrays the character and achievements of the late Representative ROBERT A. EVERETT.

The eulogy follows:

"Fear not for I am with thee. Be not dismayed for I am God. I will strengthen thee, yea I will help thee. Yea I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteous-

ness, for I the Lord thy God will hold thy right hand saying unto thee fear not, I will help thee." (Isaiah 41.)

A week after assuming the Pastorate here, I received a letter from Congressman Everett pledging his continued Church support and offering his personal assistance day or night. This characterized Mr. Everett's life. Unselfish service and untiring helpfulness.

The news media termed it a rash that two years ago hospitalized our beloved Congressman. Keenly aware of my pastoral responsibilities, I proceeded to write Mr. Everett in jest regarding his rash, yet assuring him that we had genuine concern for his physical well-being. Three days later, I received a letter thanking me for my concern. However, the burden of his communication had to do with his clarifying my salutation. For you see, I had addressed him "Congressman Robert Ashton Everett." He requested that I call him "Fats" as did all his friends.

This, too, characterized his life, humility and an absence of pride. He refused to change a life-long name among the titles of deserving and recognized honors. To his beloved family and innumerable friends, the nickname "Fats" described not so much his physique as it pictures his heart.

Magnanimous was his soul in its burning zeal to help others. Here he harvested his deepest satisfaction and his highest joy, be it for widow, teenager, governor, or clergyman.

The Angel of Death touched with angelic softness our beloved Fats a little past the noon hour of his life. However, the early hour failed to rob him of a rich and abundant life. He was to taste early the responsibilities reserved for those of more mature years. Here, at this altar in his early 20's, he was ordained as an Elder, the youngest in the Church's history. The year he received his college diploma, he was elected to the court of his native county. Yes, life with its vision filled his vessel early, enabling its outpouring to realize comfortable completeness.

Our jovial giant, our Representative and Legislator, no doubt looks down upon his assembly with approving smiles and celestial joy, for here are gathered his beloved family, his staff, his distinguished colleagues, and his cherished fellow men.

The youth who aspire to heights of political achievement in public service will in wisdom study the life of this great political figure. His was an envious position, coveted by all who seek the opinion of their fellow men at the polls. The answer may or may not be unique. Fats, early in life, sought voters out which he could cultivate as friends, whereas too often, others seek friends out of which they can cultivate voters.

Yesterday, while we mourned his passing, it was as if the angels shed their soft snowflake tears to blanket in white the purity of his native soil. I like to think of this world as a park filled with frozen lakes for skating, playgrounds, trees and grassy lawns, museums and swimming pools. We, like children, are privileged to spend a day in this great park. The time we are privileged to spend is not the same in length, in light, nor in beauty. Some days are long and sunlit; others are cloudy and stormy, as in a winter's tale. Some are able to stay only a few short hours. Some must go home at noon while the sun is still shining. For each of us, the moment comes when the Nurse Death takes us by the hand and quietly says, "It's going time now, my Love . . . come, come with me."

This our beloved one now has answered that summons. For him, the menace of the world has hushed. The fervor of life is over, and his work is done. One need not eulogize his life to you who have known him. His life tells its own story. The friendships expressed here demonstrate his influence. Though he never married, through kindness, hopefulness, encouragement and love, he

gathered about him a family synonymous with his stature and his big heart.

Some come to the end of life filled with remorse and regret. "Take my wasted years and bury them with me," said one. He had misused his life and furthered no great cause of human welfare, and buried his abilities in cheap, selfish security. Of such the Master said, "Thou wicked and slothful servant," and instructed that he be cast into outer darkness.

The sweetest words which one can ever hear and the most beautiful benediction that concludes life, the most coveted epitaph, was Christ's farewell, by these words spoken by Jesus when He said, "Well done, thy good and faithful servant, thou hast been faithful over all things. I will make thee ruler over many. Enter thou into the joy of the Lord."

This one we honor led an unselfish, devoted life. The world has been made better for his having lived. Surely the congratulatory hand of life's all-wise Judge reaches out with the accompaniment, "Well done." Death comes to him as a friend. We often wish in a childish wonder why God created the universe, and Death comes to all of us.

We too often feel that Death is an enemy of life, and not a friend, but this is not right. It is the knowledge that our years are limited that makes them so precious. Plato was right when he declared that infinite life on this earth for us human beings would not be desirable even if it were possible. Who would want to live a never-ending existence on earth, through endless years of struggle and revolution, pain and worry, conflict and labor, with no possibility of escape? What drudgery of day would never end? If you toll through the cold bitter damp day looking forward to the evening shadows, time never moves so slowly it seems the day would never end. Then, when evening finally came, how welcome. What peace and embracing rest, what satisfied relief, what a wonderful friend.

Death came as a wonderful friend to this one. The best is yet to be. Death is only a new beginning. It is like going to bed on a bleak night and waking with the sun always shining. Victor Hugo, the French author wrote, "When I go down to the grave, I can say like many others, I have finished my life. My day's work will begin the next day." The tomb is not a blind alley; it is a thoroughfare. It closes on the twilight, and opens on the dawn.

A giant pine, magnificent and bold, stood staunch against the sky, and all around shed beauty and grace and power. Within its folds, birds safely reared their young. The velvet ground beneath was gentle, and the cooling shade gave cheers to passersby. Its towering arms, a landmark, stood erect and unafraid, as if to say "Fear not, my life's love." It fell one day, where it had dauntily stood with loneliness and void, but men who passed paid tribute and said, "To know this life was good; it left its mark on Thee." Its work stands fast, this giant pine, magnificent and bold.

For Fats, life's gavel has struck its final adjournment. It was a great and productive session. The rush and fervor of life is over; the office phone comes to rest in its cradle.

However, "He is not dead. Why should we weep because he takes an hour of sleep? A rest before God's greater morn, answers a new world is born, a world where he may do the things he failed in here, where sorrows, stains, and disappointments yield to joy, where cares and fears cannot destroy. He is not dead. He hurried on ahead of us to greet the dawn, that he might meet the loved who left us yesterday. We are bereaved, but weep not. Hail him where afar he waits for us on some bright star. He is not dead. Beyond all strife at last he wins the prize of life."

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUYKENDALL).

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, if our dear friend and colleague, "FATS" EVERETT, were able to speak to us today, I am sure he would say with the poet:

Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me.
Let there be no moaning of the bar
When I put out to sea.

For if ever there was a mortal who met the challenges of life with head high and braced for every storm that man was "FATS" EVERETT. His was a dedicated life—dedicated to love of country, compassion for his fellowman, devotion to duty and country. In the face of vicissitudes which would have made lesser men pale, "FATS" stood tall and strong and seemed to grow in stature with every blow. Surely, it will be many years before the impact he made upon this House is forgotten.

For me, the loss of "FATS" EVERETT is a personal loss. He was a friend in every sense of the word. I had known him long before coming to Congress, known of his unselfish service to the people he represented from the Eighth District of Tennessee. But I became even closer to him as a freshman Congressman who benefited from his kindness, his consideration and his eagerness to help make my orientation in this honorable body easier. There are others who will detail the life of "FATS" EVERETT, his honorable service to his country in time of war, his experiences in the State legislature and the record he made in Congress. My purpose is to note that he was among us and is no longer. Because he was here, this body, his beloved State, and our country is better for it.

The mark "FATS" left on the lives of those he touched was made beautifully clear at his funeral services. Strange as it may sound, "FATS" funeral was not a sad affair and that is the way he would have wanted it. Everyone who ever knew him, and certainly those gathered to bid him farewell were so filled with "FATS" wonderful philosophy of life that none of us felt he was really gone, but there with us and I am sure, indeed, he was.

No funeral oration was ever filled with greater meaning and significance than that delivered by the Reverend Scott Johnson. I include it, here as a part of this tribute to "FATS."

I would also like to include two editorials from the Memphis newspapers paying tribute to "FATS."

The first, "ROBERT A. EVERETT," is from the Memphis Commercial Appeal, and the second, "Representative ROBERT A. 'FATS' EVERETT," is from the Memphis Press-Scimitar:

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal]

ROBERT A. EVERETT

The summer Robert A. Everett was graduated from college he was elected to the Obion County Court. Public service was his life work without interruption.

He learned about methods and personalities of Washington on the staff of a senator, and gained the same knowledge of Nashville on the staff of a governor. There followed four years as the voice and sparkplug

of the Tennessee County Services Association, of which he was executive secretary.

More important to him than knowledge of political mechanics was an extraordinary accumulation of friends and admirers in every part of the state. He was one of those personalities of whom country folks used to say, "He never met a stranger." His voice was hearty and his laugh was real, and frequent.

Mr. Everett returned to Washington under his own power as a member of the House in 1958 and has been re-elected ever since. Without oratory or committee room spectaculars, he simply kept in close touch with the people of his district and in tune with their wishes.

The climax came last year, when all other Democrats stayed out of the primary in which he was renominated, and all Republicans stayed away from the opportunity to oppose him in the election.

During most of his years in Congress his district ended at the Shelby County line but many people in Memphis counted him as a friend and called on him when he could be helpful. Adding part of Shelby County to his district was anything but a problem to him or to his new constituents.

In his final year he was a conspicuous defender of the people's tax investments in highways against the threat of bigger trucks. It was a minority position when he took it but as the months passed it became the dominant attitude of Congress.

Death has cut short his career but left an example of service in public office which the new generation will do well to remember.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Press Scimitar]
REPRESENTATIVE R. A. "FATS" EVERETT

It is with no disrespect toward Robert Ashton Everett that we include his nickname in the caption of this editorial. Our Eighth District Congressman who died yesterday shortly before he reached the age of 54, himself insisted on the nickname. On his election to Congress in 1958, some newspapers thought it more dignified to drop the "Fats." Everett protested. He had been known by that nickname all his life, and "when they say 'Fats' I know they're talking about me," he said.

The name referred to his great size. He was 6 feet 4 and weighed up to 370 pounds. He was proud of being "the biggest man in Congress."

But "Fats" Everett was more than big in physical size. He had a big heart. And no public official ever was closer to the voters than "Fats." He was a man of the people and never lost communication with them. He was elected last fall to his sixth term in the House, without opposition. He went to Congress after serving as a county court member (at age 21) and circuit court clerk in Obion County, then as executive assistant first to the late Senator Tom Stewart, then to former Governor Gordon Browning.

Congressman Everett was friendly and jolly—the nickname, "Fats," seems to be a mark of likableness for almost anyone who wears it—but he worked constantly and seriously for the best interests of his constituents, among whom were citizens of the northern strip of Shelby County.

He was a conservative Democrat who did not hesitate to vote with the Republicans in Congress when he thought they were right. He was instrumental, as a subcommittee chairman, in getting improved legislation for nursing service for veterans. One of his last and biggest battles in Congress was against the bill to permit extra truck trailers. He helped kill it last year just before he went to the hospital and began his losing fight against ill health. He also opposed congressional pay raises. Two of his major goals for his district, as yet unachieved, were a Mississippi River Bridge between upper West Tennessee and Missouri and a navigable canal between the Obion River and the Tennessee River near Paris, Tenn.

We know of no congressman more beloved by the people who sent him repeatedly to Washington, and few, if any, who were more liked and respected by his fellow members of Congress.

FUNERAL MESSAGE FOR ROBERT ASHTON "FATS" EVERETT

(Delivered by Rev. Scott Johnson, Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Union City)

"Fear thou not, for I am with thee; be not dismayed, for I am thy God; I will strengthen thee; yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness. For I, the Lord thy God, will hold thy right hand, saying unto thee, Fear not; I will help thee." (Isa. 41:10-13, A.S.V.)

(There was a prayer and scripture read by Dr. Morris Pepper here.)

A week after assuming pastorate here I received a letter from Congressman Everett pledging his continued church support and offering his personal assistance day or night. This characterized Mr. Everett's life—unselfish and untiring helpfulness.

The news medium termed it a *rash*, nearly two years ago, which hospitalized our beloved Congressman. Keenly aware of my pastoral responsibility, I proceeded to write Mr. Everett in jest of his rash, yet assuring him we had genuine concern for his physical well being. Three days later I received a letter thanking me for my concern; however, the burden of his communication had to do with his clarifying my salutation; for you see, I had addressed him, "Congressman Robert Ashton Everett." He requested I call him "Fats" as did all his friends. This, too, characterized his life—humility and an absence of pride. He refused to change a life-long name for the pomp or titles of deserving and recognized honor. To his beloved family and innumerable friends the nickname, "Fats," describes not so much his physique as it pictures his heart. Magnanimous was his soul in its burning zeal to help others. Here, he harvested his deepest satisfaction and his highest joy, be it for a widow, a teen-ager, a governor, or a clergyman.

The angel, Death, touched with angelic softness our beloved "Fats" a little past the noon hour of his life; however, the early hour failed to rob him of a rich and abundant life. He was to taste early the responsibilities reserved for those of more mature years. Here in this altar, in his early twenties, he was ordained an elder, the youngest in the church's history. The year he received his college diploma he was elected to the Court of his native county. Yes, life with its apocalyptic vision filled his vessel early, enabling its outpouring to realize creditable completeness.

Our jovial giant, our representative and legislator, no doubt looks down upon this assembly with approving smile and celestial joy. For here are gathered his beloved family, his staff, his distinguished colleagues, and his cherished fellow-Tennesseans. The youth who aspires heights of political achievement and public service will in wisdom study the life of this great political figure. His was an envious position, coveted by all who seek the opinion of their fellowman at the polls. The answer may, or may not, be unique—"Fats" early in life sought voters out of which he could cultivate friends, whereas too often others seek friends out of which they may cultivate voters.

Yesterday, while we mourned his passing, it was as if the angels shed their soft snowflake tears to blanket in white purity his native soil.

I like to think of this world as a park filled with frozen lakes for skating, playgrounds, trees and grassy lawns, museums, and swimming pools. We, like children, are privileged to spend a day in the great park. The time we are privileged to spend is not the same in length, in light, nor in beauty. Some days are long and sunlit; others are cloudy and

stormy, as in a winter's tale. Some are able to stay only a few short hours. Some must go home at noon while the sun is still shining. For each of us the moment comes when nurse, Death, takes us by the hand and quietly says, "It's going home time now, my love; come, come with me."

This, our beloved one, now has answered that summons. For him the business of the world has hushed, the fever of life is over, and his work is done. One need not eulogize his life to you who have known him; his life tells its own story. The friendship expressed here demonstrates his influence. Though he never married, through kindness, helpfulness, encouragement and love he gathered about him a family synonymous with his huge statue and big heart.

Some come to the end of life filled with remorse and regret. "Take my wasted years," said one, "and bury them with me." He had misused his life, had furthered no great cause of human welfare, had buried his abilities in cheap selfish security. To such, the master said, "Thou wicked and slothful servant," and that he be cast into outer darkness.

The sweetest words which one could ever hear, the most beautiful benediction that could conclude life, the most coveted epitaph that could grace one's farewell, would be these words spoken by Jesus when he said, "Well done thou good and faithful servant: Thou hast been faithful over a few things; I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." This one we honor lived a useful, devoted, unselfish life. The world has been made better for his having lived. Surely, the congratulatory hand of life's all-wise Judge reaches out to the accompaniment, "Well done."

Death comes to him as a friend. We often wish in a childish way that life would never end, and in our rebellious moments wonder why God created the universe so death comes at all. We, too often, feel death is an enemy of life—and not a friend. But this is not right. It is the knowledge that our years are limited that makes them so precious. Plato was right when he declared that infinite life on this earth for us human beings would not be desirable, even if it were possible. Who would want to live a never-ending existence on earth, through endless years of struggle and revolution, pain and worry, conflict and labor—with no possibility of escape? What drudgery if day would never end? Have you toiled through the cold, bitter, damp day looking forward to the evening shadows? Time moved so slowly; it seemed the day would never end. Then, when evening finally came, how welcome! What peace and embracing rest; what satisfying release! What a wonderful friend!

Death came as a wonderful friend to this one. The best is yet to be. Death is only a new beginning. It is like going to bed on a cold bleak night, and waking with the sun always shining. Victor Hugo, the French author, wrote, "When I go down to the grave, I can say, like many others, 'I have finished my days' work, but I cannot say, 'I have finished my life.' My days' work will begin the next morning. The tomb is not a blind alley; it is a thoroughfare. It closes on the twilight and opens on the dawn!"

"A giant pine, magnificent and bold, stood staunch against the sky and all around shed beauty, grace, and power. Within its fold birds safely reared their young. The velvet ground beneath was gentle, and the cooling shade gave cheer to passers-by. Its towering arms a landmark, stood erect and unafraid, as if to say, 'Fear naught from life's alarms.'"

"It fell one day. Where it had dauntless stood was loneliness and void. But men who passed paid tribute—said, 'To know this life was good. It left its mark on me; its work stands fast.' And so, it lives; such life no bonds can hold—this giant pine, magnificent and bold." (Georgia Harkness.)

For "Fats," life's gavel has struck its final adjournment; it was a great and productive

session—the rush and fever of life is over; the office phone comes to rest in its cradle. However:

THE VICTOR

He is not dead. Why should we weep
Because he takes an hour of sleep,
A rest before God's greater Morn
Answers a new world is born;
A world where he may do the things
He failed in here; where sorrow stings
And disappointment yield to joy;
Where cares and fears cannot destroy?
He is not dead. He hurried on
Ahead of us to greet the dawn,
That he might meet the loved who left
Us yesterday. We are bereft—
But weep not—hail him where, afar,
He waits for us on some bright star.
He is not dead. Beyond all strife
At last he wins the prize of life.

THOMAS CURTIS CLARK.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. ABERNETHY).

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, "FATS" EVERETT was my very warm personal friend. I came to know him long before he became a Member of this body. His passing hurt me deeply.

"FATS" EVERETT was widely known throughout my State and throughout the entire Midsouth. He made warm friendships in every town and community in that area, as well as throughout this Nation. The Midsouth never produced a more popular or more lovable person.

Mr. Speaker, I recall vividly the election night when "FATS" EVERETT first ran for Congress. On that night other interested Members of this body and I sat in the office of a Memphis newspaper reporter stationed here in Washington. We anxiously awaited the election returns. We waited and waited. Finally the returns began to trickle in. And we were so pleased. "FATS" took the lead from the beginning and held it all the way.

In that campaign and election "FATS" won out over formidable opposition. He was great in victory, and he was great as a servant of the people he represented here in this Congress. He will be as great as he sits at the hand of the One who gave him life on this earth, and who has given him everlasting life above.

Mr. Speaker, "FATS" EVERETT was loved by as many people as any man I have ever known. He was a friend of as many people as any man I have ever known. I have served in this House of Representatives for a long time, and I have seen many Members come and go. A more popular Member never served here. I have heard it said that there are Members who have served without making enemies, or without raising the ire of any of their colleagues. However, some of us sometimes cross the paths of our colleagues and on occasion ill words come between us. But such never happened to "FATS" EVERETT during his service here. He could turn the most controversial argument, the most heated debate into a love feast. And he often did.

He was the close friend of all Members, and every Member of this House loved

him. He left a mark in this body which will of itself be a lasting monument to his service and his life. It will not be necessary for the people of his district or of his State to erect any monuments to his service, to his life, or to his memory. "FATS" attended to this with his friendly attitude, with kind words for everyone, with the rendition of extraordinary service to his people and his country, with his statesmanship and with his unusual capacity to spread sunshine on the most cloudy of days and comfort and happiness in hours of despair. Time and tide take their toll of monuments cast in stone; but those which "FATS" erected will live to the end of time.

The passing of "FATS" EVERETT left a void in this House. The void will be a lasting one. His seat will be filled but his place in this body and among his people will be forever vacant. There was but one ROBERT "FATS" EVERETT. There will never be another.

We sympathize with his beloved mother, a mother to whom he was so devoted. We sympathize with other members of his family; and we join with the people of Tennessee in mourning his passing.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker with a sad heart, I joined other congressional colleagues from Tennessee and from some other States in a special trip to Union City, Tenn., on January 28, 1969, to pay last respects and bid farewell to a man who had given us all much joy, the Honorable ROBERT A. "FATS" EVERETT.

My own life was much enriched just by having known this big man. He worked harder than anyone I know and he enjoyed serving people more than anyone. "FATS" never shunned problems, people, or work. He met problems head on; greeted everyone with equal gusto and concern no matter what his rank in life; and worked as long as there was anything he could do for his district, his State, or his country.

I was especially fortunate to have "FATS" as a close friend, and always was pleased to pick up the telephone and hear him on the other end of the line. Although we sat on opposite sides of the aisle in the House of Representatives, we spent much time together working for the people of our State—a young military man with a problem, a veteran who needed urgent medical attention, an older citizen who needed a little more money to meet his bills.

"FATS" and I served together on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and the Public Works Committee and thus we spent many hours together in committee work. He worked especially hard for improved medical care for our veterans for he thought that they who had suffered in defending peace and this country should have the best of care.

As a committee member he toured Veterans' Administration hospitals and as he went about his study of the facilities he cheered patients in the rooms and wards along the way. His humor was especially down to earth and no one could help but laugh with him.

Many of his findings showed up in legislation that passed the Congress and

that is now providing better medical and nursing care for thousands of veterans.

"FATS" was just as concerned about our work in the Public Works Committee, and never hesitated to speak out. Perhaps one of his greatest ambitions was to see a bridge over the Mississippi River to connect Tennessee and Missouri, and construction has been started.

As evidence of his concern for the land and people of our area, he assumed the presidency of the Lower Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association in late December when he already was very weak from battling his illness.

The story of "FATS" EVERETT is a colorful and exciting one because he made life that way. His friends and constituents always called him the big man with the big heart who wore a big hat. And that is true.

He truly was happy serving his fellowman and thus service was his life.

He served us well in the classroom when he taught, in the military when the Government had to make some extra large uniforms to stretch over his big form, in State and local governments where he held several offices, and then in the Congress of the United States.

Everywhere everyone liked "FATS." Those of us who were fortunate enough to have him as a close friend are thankful for this special blessing.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. EDMONDSON).

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to join in this tribute to a beloved colleague who will be missed for a long time in this House—the Honorable ROBERT EVERETT, of Tennessee.

BOB was an able and effective Member of the Congress, and served with great distinction on the Committee on Public Works. He did a great job for Tennessee and for his district, and was a tireless worker in behalf of his constituents.

There is no one in the House today who would not agree that this big Tennessean was wonderful company in any gathering, and one of our best loved Members.

We will all miss him, and the House will not be the same without him.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. KEE).

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to our departed colleague, the late Honorable ROBERT A. EVERETT.

Congressman "FATS" EVERETT, as he was known, was my friend. He was a friend of all who met him. And he was a dedicated man—dedicated to representing his people in the Congress in the only way that he knew—sincerity of purpose. His deep resonant voice may be stilled, but the spirit of this devoted man will linger on in the hearts of all of us who had learned to love and respect him.

When the news of Congressman EVERETT's death was known on the Hill—I heard it said by one who had worked closely with him over the years "Heaven is a brighter place this morning because 'FATS' has arrived at his eternal home."

The State of Tennessee and the Na-

tion have lost an outstanding citizen, and we in the House have lost a great friend—an accomplished legislator.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Brock).

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I value the opportunity afforded by the gentleman in the well. I would like to join today in paying respect to a man who was one of the most beloved Members of this body.

Besides his distinguished legislative record, which speaks for itself, "FATS" EVERETT made a treasured contribution to the Congress in a less tangible, perhaps, but especially important way—he gave us an unflinching sense of friendship and honest fellowship; for the love in his heart and the laughter in his voice never failed him, even in the midst of grave illness.

An ancient philosopher once wrote that, "honest men esteem and value nothing so much in this world as a real friend."

In "FATS" EVERETT, I was blessed with such a friend, and so were we all. That kindness and humor which helped so much to heal a few bruised spirits after the heat of legislative debate will be a little rarer now. We will miss it, as we will miss "FATS" EVERETT, our beloved colleague.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. Anderson).

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the custom which we observe today is as it should be, for ours is in modesty a small and sorely tested profession; respect and friendship sustained in service here is largely without comfort of illusion or benefit of leisure and must normally survive occasional conflicts over issues of importance and passion. Attachments thus formed are cherished; they run deep and are broken only with great sadness and a profound sense of loss.

Yet there is indeed something unusual about standing in formal eulogy to ROBERT A. EVERETT. He did not pad his life with formality. He was totally devoid of the intensive posturings and even the pompousness which forever tempt holders of high office. Scarcely a Member here ever knew him by name other than "FATS". But such was the nature of the man that this name was worn with unquestioned dignity and imposing power of personality. Certainly he was a formidable opponent and one could not have a more valuable ally, nor a more shrewdly realistic analyst on any item of legislation at issue. I have never known a man less likely to be deluded by flights of fine, pure rhetoric or technical jargon.

In the last analysis, for us of this House, perhaps the finest that can be said of any Member is that "he represented his constituency well and truly." "FATS" EVERETT had the home roots and sensitivity to know Tennesseans well, and the strength of wit and will, the integrity, and the robust conviction to represent them and their interests, as they would have it done, in Congress. They judged it so, and in our society their

judgment is the final and unquestioned one. In half of all his many elections to this House, "FATS" EVERETT ran without opposition, and he never once got less than two-thirds of the vote.

The Tennessee delegation lost a good deal of color, character, and power with the passing of this gentleman with imposing presence and booming voice. Congress has lost a contributor of unique style and a talent for humor to match his size. His constituents have lost a representative to whom their interests always came first. We of this House have lost a colleague whose mere word of greeting somehow made the day brighter, and burdens easier to bear.

We shall miss him sorely.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. STUBBLEFIELD).

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee for yielding to me in order that I might join my colleagues in paying my respects to my dear friend.

Mr. Speaker, the late beloved Representative ROBERT A. EVERETT was a close personal friend of mine for many years. We were both elected to Congress in 1958, and served neighboring congressional districts. But I am proud to say we were friends long before that, for we first got to know each other 35 years ago when he was a popular student and campus leader at Murray State University in my hometown of Murray, Ky.

It was a great and wonderful thing to have been his friend. He had hundreds of them, because he had a love of life, and for his fellow man, that welled up and touched everyone he met. No friend could have been more loyal, more anxious, and willing to help whoever stretched out a hand in need.

He had an instinctive understanding of young people, too, and they had an affection for him that was amazing in a time when cynicism is such a popular affectation of our youth. During his illness and hospital confinement, students he had befriended at Murray State sent him a get-well telegram with hundreds of signatures. He had attended all of the homecomings there until his health declined in recent years. Wearing a big hat and towering above the crowd at 6 feet, 4 inches, he was a familiar sight at campus gatherings and at football games.

He was a big, big, man with a heart and soul that outmatched even his tremendous frame. His size almost kept him out of the military service, but the Army was so impressed with his patriotism and determination that they tailored his uniforms to order. His origins were in Obion County, Tenn., and his was the simple yet rich heritage of rural Tennessee. It gave him strength and sincerity which inspired the trust of everyone he met.

He always greeted his constituents by their first names. Thousands of them thought he was the best Representative the Eighth District ever had, and maybe the best Congressman in the United States. Beneath his "country boy" exterior he was a skillful leader who knew how to "go to the head of the stream" to get things done. He was a realist, a down-

to-earth man who, seeing things as they were, was able to accomplish much during his relatively short life.

Because of his membership on the House Public Works Committee, he was able to make sure that his district was never left out when it came to projects that would help or benefit his constituents. It was he who finally managed to snip away the redtape which had been hindering flood control programs in water-ravaged Obion County for years, thus reclaiming thousands of acres of rich farmland. His sponsorship of the Reelfoot-Indian Creek watershed project saved Reelfoot Lake from imminent destruction and was an invaluable contribution to the conservation and recreation use of Tennessee's water resources. He also managed to obtain final approval of the long-delayed construction of a Mississippi River bridge linking West Tennessee and Missouri.

These projects will stand as permanent memorials to a great man and a great legislator. But his greatest memorial is to be found in the recollections of the thousands of individuals whose lives were affected by the kindnesses, great and small, which he bestowed upon them. He will never be forgotten by the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee, where he was important to everybody, where he was everybody's friend. He worked for those many friends, right up to the day he died, because that work was more important to him than anything else, including his health.

His untimely death has been a great loss to me and to all his many other friends. I join my colleagues in extending my deepest sympathy to his wonderful mother.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, our hearts were saddened last month by the passing of one of our best loved Members. The courageous, valiant struggle for life waged by Representative ROBERT A. "FATS" EVERETT for so many months was lost on January 26, 1969. The loss is shared by the people of his district, his State, and his country.

I personally mourn his passing for many reasons, reasons which are shared by a large number of Members. I remember very well the attention and encouragement he gave me as a new Member. I remember the helpful, carefully considered advice he continued to give me whenever I would turn to him.

Mr. Speaker, I have filled the vacancy on the Veterans' Affairs Committee left by "FATS" but not his place or the reputation he made on that committee.

His service in Congress was just short of 11 years. The House of Representatives was privileged to know and to benefit from his service during those 11 years.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Downing).

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our beloved friend "FATS" EVERETT has left a void in the House of Repre-

representatives. He was a man of great abilities which he well used on behalf of his district, State, and Nation. But it was that great sense of humor we shall miss the most. A few brief words with "Fats" could make a dull day bright. I suppose he drove home more points with humor than any man has ever done with logic. He was a big man in every respect and his death has left his friends with a big emptiness and sorrow. I extend my deepest personal sympathy to members of his family.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, certainly it was an honor and a privilege to serve with the Honorable "Fats" EVERETT—that is what he wanted to be called—for the past 4 years.

Most of the Members of this House are political creatures, we might say, and have gone through the fiery furnace of political tribulation and are rather sensitive to the things which go on about us.

Because "Fats" was always cheerful and joyful, I sought his advice on many occasions, and always came away exhilarated, with my attitude improved.

Certainly the gentleman from Tennessee had an excellent effect, a great and a good effect, upon the other Members.

I remember asking him on one occasion how he felt, and he said, "Why, I am just booming. Always be a-booming. It makes your friends happy and your enemies sad. If you feel bad do not tell anybody; they might enjoy hearing it."

Such was the character of the inimitable "Fats" EVERETT.

We have lost a great confrere.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. SLACK).

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, the untimely death of the Honorable ROBERT A. EVERETT, of the Eighth District of Tennessee, came as a personal shock to me, even though I had known of his poor health during preceding months. His passing will leave in this Chamber a void not to be filled except by an individualist of equal caliber.

Widely and affectionately known as "Fats," he had been in Congress only 11 months when I became a Member of the House of Representatives, and by virtue of his generous spirit we soon became good friends. The gentleman from Tennessee was often of great assistance to me, and was ever willing to advise and suggest when I sought his counsel.

He gathered friends easily, because like another American of similar mold, he "never met a man he didn't like." For the pleasure of his company, for his great fund of stories, for his endless pleasantries, he was widely known beyond the boundaries of his native State of Tennessee, and here while on official duty many of us found that a pause to talk with him provided a refreshing break in the concentration required by the day's affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the words of Rudyard Kipling, "If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue, or walk with kings—nor lose the common touch," best describe "Fats" EVERETT. He was a tireless worker for his district and State, and the smallest problem of a single constituent received the same dedication as a public project involving thousands of dollars.

"Fats" had a favorite saying when confronted with a formidable problem. "Let's go to the head of the stream," he would say, indicating his determination to take his problem to the top. The gentleman would go to the top, and he usually achieved a satisfactory solution in a short time.

Mr. Speaker, this Chamber will not be the same without "Fats" EVERETT. He will be missed by every Member on both sides of the aisle. His passing was a personal loss to me, and I extend my deepest sympathy to his mother and his host of close friends at home in Tennessee.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HUNGATE).

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this body can take a great deal of learning and erudition from men of skill, but I think it is the laughter and the humor generated by "Fats" EVERETT which lubricated the discussions in this body.

His funeral was an impressive thing. The music was outstanding, as it should be in Tennessee. There was no singing, but I think I could almost hear "Fats" saying, "I don't want no singing. If they want singing, let's have a dance."

He was a man of great wit.

Albert Camus once said that:

All great deeds and all great thoughts have a ridiculous beginning. Great works are jokes often born on a streetcorner or in a restaurant's revolving door.

When I was little I always looked forward to the circus coming to town. I used to like to listen to the Barker out in the front holler, "See the only armless sculptor in the world." He puts the chisel in his mouth and his wife hits him on the back of the head with a mallet.

My sister-in-law joined a circus as a fire eater but she lost that job when her pilot light went out. One day she hiccupped two bonfires and burned the tent down.

My uncle was with a circus for a while. They introduced him as the petrified man. They had to let him go because it cost too much to keep him petrified.

Then he became a tight wire walker until one night he was tight and the wire was not. Actually he was nearsighted and what he thought was the wire was only a crack in his glasses.

Like great works, deep feelings always mean more to us than we can put into words. In Lawrence Ferlinghetti's works we learn:

This life is not a circus where
The shy performing dogs of love look on
As time flicks out
Its tricky whip
To race us through our paces.

Constantly risking absurdity and death
Whenever he performs above the heads of his audience

The poet like an acrobat climbs on rime
To a high wire of his own making
And balancing on eyebeams above a sea of faces

Paces his way to the other side of the day
Performing entrechats and sleight of foot tricks

And other high theatrics and all without mistaking
Anything for what it may not be
For he's the super realist who must perforce perceive
Taut truth before the taking of each stance or step.

In his supposed advance
Toward that still higher perch
Where beauty stands and waits with gravity
To start her death-defying leap
And he a little Charley Chaplin man
Who may or may not catch
Her fair eternal form spreadeagled in the empty air of existence.

While still around the circus ring
Lope the misshapen camels of lust
And all of us Emmett Kelly clowns
Always making up imaginary scenes
With all our masks for faces
Even eat fake last suppers at collapsible tables

And mocking cross ourselves in circuit sawdust crosses
And yet gobble up at last to shrive our circus souls
The also imaginary wafers of grace.

I think "Fats" EVERETT's humor is proof of this.

All great deeds and all great thoughts have a ridiculous beginning. Great works are often born on a street corner.

Standing on the corner, I didn't mean no harm

Along come a Police, he took me by the arm.
It was down in Memphis, corner of Beale and Main

He says "Big boy, you'll have to tell me your name."

I said "You'll find my name on the tail of my shirt."

"I'm a Tennessee hustler and I don't have to work."

I wish I could learn to laugh at myself
Somehow have the wisdom to see
That the very best joke in all of the world
Is the fellow that I call me
I know I'm not Utopia's king
I allow I'm a laughable joint,
But in spite of the fact that I know I'm a joke

I have never quite seen the point
I wish I could learn to laugh at myself
'Twould save me a lot of conceit,
And show me that out of earth's harvest of souls

I'm not quite the choice of the wheat.
'Twould save me from being a Pharisee,
From looking on life so sour
And seriously thinking to save mankind
By the strength of my own great power.

There is no sun without shadow, and it is essential to know the night.

'Tis late and cold; stir up the fire;
Sit close and draw the table higher;
Be merry, and drink the wine that's old,
A hearty medicine 'gainst a cold:
Call for the best the house may ring.
Sack, white and claret let them bring
Plover, partridge for your dinner
And a capon for the sinner,
Welcome, welcome, shall fly round
And I shall smile, tho' underground.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the death of Representative EVERETT has saddened all Members of Congress. We who knew him appreciated his character and his willingness to be of service to his constituents and mankind. We are heartbroken.

All his life his ambition was to serve in the Congress of the United States. He obtained that honor and "FATS" was truly a representative of the people.

Constituents in his district expressed the sentiments "We are heartbroken—a great voice has been hushed—our voice." "FATS" EVERETT was a man of simple yet great heritage. Perhaps this is the best way to remember this unusual and gifted man whose love for people turned him into one of the finest and most dedicated civil servants this body has ever known. He was never too busy to talk to anyone and it was a rare occurrence when he could not be reached by telephone. "I will always be as near to you as your telephone or mail box" he said thousands of times, and he meant every word of it. No letter went unanswered.

He knew and loved people from all walks of life—from the poor to the wealthy. He was important to everybody and he was a friend of everybody. He spent his life doing for others. The House of Representatives has lost one of its most colorful leaders.

From the depth of our sympathy and depression we pause in respect and pay tribute to one of our own. Our greatest honor to him would be to resolve to serve every man, every woman, and every child faithfully, honestly and diligently as he has done.

I want to extend my sympathy to his mother as I know her bereavement is great.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER).

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the able gentleman from Tennessee who is now in the well for permitting me to join with him and our colleagues here in paying tribute to our beloved departed colleague whom we affectionately knew as "FATS" EVERETT.

When I was a Member of the other body I came to be his friend. He was the administrative assistant to one of our distinguished colleagues, the Honorable Tom Stewart, a Senator from Tennessee. Every Member of the Senate knew "FATS" EVERETT. He was constantly on the floor or in the cloakrooms. They liked him because he had about him that inimitable warm quality of friendship which made everyone love him. He was a man ever eager to do something to be helpful to any Member in any way he possibly could.

When I came to this body it was a great joy to me that we could renew our friendship as colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, "FATS" EVERETT was a big man in stature. But he was also big in many other respects. He had a great heart full of compassion. He had a noble vision. And, above everything else he

had a consuming love of his country and we will never be able to acknowledge adequately the great and diligent work which he did for the veterans of our country.

I had an experience last year which shows how devoted he was to the service of our veterans. After participating in the dedication of a veterans' hospital in Miami, I conceived the idea that we needed to establish a system of custodial homes for veterans beyond eligibility for domiciliary institutions or the veterans' hospitals. I came back and went directly to "FATS" EVERETT, chairman of the Hospitalization Subcommittee of the Veterans' Committee, and told him about my idea. He said, "Listen; that is a good idea. Anything we can do for the veteran, for goodness sake, let us do it."

He said, "Let me send our general counsel over there to help draft the bill. Then just as soon as you get the bill introduced you let me know, and I will set up hearings for you before our committee."

That was characteristic of his eagerness to serve the veterans of this country and the people of this country. We will never again have the like of "FATS" EVERETT in this body.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we lament his passing today, I am reminded to paraphrase the words of another, who said we sigh for the touch of a vanished hand that was warm; for a friendly voice that is still. With all of our hearts we extend our sympathy to his beloved and grieving mother, and to his loved ones, upon the passing of "FATS" EVERETT.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we all loved "FATS" EVERETT here on the floor, and I just suppose we all assume that everybody liked him everywhere.

Two years ago I had a unique experience that I would like to share with my colleagues here today. My father visited Washington at the age of 89, and I introduced my father to Congressman EVERETT. My father had grown up in the little community of Dukedom near Fulton, Tenn. That was in "FATS" district.

They began exchanging names of families that even my father could recall from some 80 years past, and "FATS" knew their sons and daughters and their uncles and their grandparents. He could go back a hundred years into the life of his district. It was such a joy to see the two of them exchange greetings.

Shortly thereafter "FATS" thought that it would be a good idea to invite me to Fulton, Tenn., for the annual Banana Festival. This took place each year because Fulton, Tenn., was an exchange point on the railroad system between Florida and the New York area. One might think it rather odd that they would hold a banana festival, but they do.

We went along with "FATS." It was one of the finest experiences of my life. When we got to the airport near his district, "FATS" was met by an entire coterie of people who were trying to please and to

satisfy "FATS." Then, when we got into the little town of Fulton, the highway patrol and the mayor and all the top officials were there to say every kind word to "FATS." When they had the parade, people would wave at him from the windows and from their automobiles and from up in the stands—not just a "hello," but almost a shout, as if they were craving recognition from him. And he never neglected any of them, and he did not miss a name in hundreds and hundreds of times.

This showed to me that in his own district "FATS" was better loved even than he was here—and that is saying a great deal. That is why to them he was the Duke of Dukedom, he was the Pied Piper of that district, he was the Matt Dillon and the Judge Parker. He was the No. 1. I never knew anybody who was nearer to his people and who more directly represented his district than "FATS," because he was a giant of a man with a giant of a heart.

Mr. Speaker, we all extend our deepest sympathies to his mother.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to join my colleagues today to pay deserved tribute to an old friend who served among us in a very special way.

I came to know the man we affectionately knew as "FATS" EVERETT very well. I served with him on the great Committee on Public Works. I can testify to his diligence and to his intelligence, because I saw him there every day we met. I heard him make his probes, his observations, and his contributions. There was where he was most effective—effective because all of us respected him, because he knew what he was talking about, and he understood the problems and he gave thought to sound solutions to those problems. That is what we witnessed of him in that great committee.

Through that association and through association with him on the floor of the House of Representatives, and socially and otherwise, I came to know—as all of us did—that he was truly a friend of everyone. Most of all, you sensed very early that he was a friend of man, and not just a friend of ours. He was a friend of mankind. He had a deep feeling for the urges of mankind and for the needs of mankind. He felt that he should represent them and he did his best to do that.

Then, too, I could perceive as I saw him in our association and as I saw him in his work, he had a deep feel for the system that we are all a part of—this institution of representative government and this Government. He sought always and in every way that he could to make his contribution to it and to strengthen it and to improve it. Yes, he had a deep feel—a keen feel—and it was really real.

He saw the rights of man regardless of creed, color, or station of life. He respected their rights and sought to meet their needs and to fulfill those needs to the limit of his capacity.

He was blessed more I think than any

man I ever knew with this thing that we call commonsense. He had good judgment. He had the capacity to make proper evaluations and come to the right conclusions. So he was intelligent in a very special way—yes, a special way—because through his association and through his attitude and through his feel he had an insight that gave him foresight. This is something that all of us need so much, especially in this arena where we are all trying sincerely to serve our country.

Then also, as so many have said already, he had a wholesome philosophy of life. He could, and did, turn a phrase that got to the nub of the thing. When we were struggling with ways to describe a situation—and I have done this many times—I went to him and said, "FATS, what do you think?" Off the top of his head would come his advice and his counsel in a phrase or in a sentence or in a short paragraph.

Then he had a tolerance, that I thought was a peculiar and a special asset, from which we could learn. Well, like so many who have served before us here, because of what he was, we have to admit that "FATS" EVERETT still lives in the hearts and minds of people.

Most of you were here when Sandburg spoke about Lincoln. At the close of that magnificent address, he said,

And how did Lincoln say he would like to be remembered? By something of what is in this occasion.

Then he told about how Lincoln had received a letter from his friend and Lincoln replied that it was impossible for him to join in the efforts for a marble monument for Lovejoy, the Representative from Illinois, and the last sentence of his letter read:

Let him have the marble monument along with that well tried and most enduring memorial in the hearts of those who love liberty unselfishly and for mankind.

This can be applied to this man—this ordinary man—but in the very special way a great man too—for he had a great soul.

It has been said that he was big. Well, he was not near as big as his heart, his attitude, his wholesome attitude for his fellowman. One of the highest and most noble things that you could say about a man is that he will be missed and this has special meaning in this instance because he is missed by so many people in every walk of life.

It is evident here and it was evident at his funeral which I was not able to go to. But I have reports on it and many have said that this was one of the greatest funerals and one of the finest tributes ever paid to a man on this kind of occasion.

Well, I miss him but I shall cherish his memory and I join all of you in extending sympathy to his State and to the Nation and to his community and to his friends, and especially to his mother.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of my distinguished colleague in yielding. I have listened with

great appreciation to the things that have been said. I subscribe to all of them. I attest to the wonderful qualities of our distinguished and beloved colleague "FATS" EVERETT, one of the very finest, one of the most human, and one of the noblest of those with whom I have been privileged to serve in the House. We shall always miss men like "FATS" EVERETT. There are not many of them.

It was a source of particular pleasure for me to have shared his friendship through the years, to have enjoyed his counsel, and to have witnessed his contributions.

He served on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs from the time he was first elected to Congress. He was a diligent, hardworking, courteous, and considerate member of that committee. For several Congresses he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Insurance and played a leading role in the hearings and debate which led to the enactment of the servicemen's group life insurance program providing automatic coverage for all those individuals who serve in our Armed Forces today. He was also chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Intermediate Care which held hearings here in Washington, conducted field investigations throughout the United States, and compiled data which led directly to the enactment of the nursing care program as found in Public Law 450 of the 88th Congress. This law which has already benefited thousands of our older veterans will truly benefit thousands more in the immediate period ahead of us.

We shall miss him greatly in the Congress for his good humor, good commonsense, and devotion to serving the people of his district and our country. I share the deep sense of loss which his family has experienced and my earnest sympathies are with them in their sorrow.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RANDALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I came on the floor not knowing that this eulogy was scheduled for today. But I would not leave until I had this opportunity to make a few remarks about our beloved and now departed friend, ROBERT A. "FATS" EVERETT. He may no longer be with us, but I am sure there is not a Member who served with him who will ever forget our former colleague. "FATS" EVERETT will always live on in the memory of those fellow Members who respected and admired him.

My contribution to this eulogy will be a brief reference to what I regard as two of his outstanding characteristics.

It is a fact that he was a big man. But he had an equally great heart. He was a humanitarian. He served on the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. It was our privilege to serve two terms with him on that committee. I happen to know he is the father of, and certainly the principal advocate of what came to be called the veterans domiciliary-care institutions. As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee he believed it was not enough simply to talk about what we were going to do for veterans by providing veterans

hospitals. When those hospitals were full, or when the maximum treatment had been given to an ailing veteran, or when the veteran was up in years and was about to be kicked out of a hospital because of lack of room, he proposed and championed the domiciliary-care institutions, to take care of our chronically ill and aging veterans.

It was once my privilege as a fellow member of the committee to journey to the edge of his State, to Bristol, Tenn., to inspect one of those institutions. I doubt if it is generally known that he devoted many, if not most, of his weekends to travel around the country to learn more about the quality of the care received by our veterans in the veterans' institutions, particularly those domiciliary-care institutions, for which he was the leading congressional advocate.

Another of his characteristics which I will take the time to mention was his characteristic of being self-effacing. He was a humble man, and possessed of true humility. I recall that upon one occasion he went into the well of the House and was heard to say he had been here several terms but that he spoke on the floor on the average of less than once a year. When he had finished those remarks I went to him and asked, "Why do you speak so infrequently?"

He answered, "Because I never thought I should make a speech or take the time of my fellow Members unless I thought I knew at least as much as any one of my listeners, and unless I could make some kind of contribution that would be worth their time to listen."

That is the way he was. He was a humble man.

Finally, I should like to refer to his long service on the Public Works Committee. There is some talk of his being honored by the naming of a bridge in northwestern Tennessee, which crosses the Mississippi into our home State of Missouri. I hope that his name may in some way be associated with that project when the time comes to give it an appropriate name.

I join in the expression of others in extending our deepest sympathy to his dear mother.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I shall take little of his time since he has asked permission that all Members may have the opportunity to extend their remarks.

I think the greatest accolade paid to a man occurred when the Veterans' Affairs Committee was notified that "FATS" EVERETT had passed away. One of the staff members said:

Well, heaven is a little brighter this morning with "FATS" EVERETT up there.

I served with him on both the Veterans' Affairs Committee and on the Public Works Committee, and I have never known a finer or greater Member of this House or a greater man.

Mr. Speaker, during the years I have served in the House of Representatives, many of our colleagues with whom we have served here in this Chamber have departed for one reason or another.

Some are naturally missed more than others, simply because of their nature, their disposition, and other characteristics which may more definitely identify them. Because of his friendliness and outgoing personality, ROBERT A. "FATS" EVERETT is certainly in this group. "FATS" was indeed a "man of the people." He knew his people and he knew their views and their wishes. Very few men who have served here have worked harder or sought more diligently to meet the wishes of his people.

I knew "FATS" EVERETT through working with him on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and the Public Works Committee. His vast knowledge and concern never failed to impress me. His district, State, and Nation have lost a most valuable servant and we in the House have lost a true friend.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to the late Congressman, ROBERT A. EVERETT, of Tennessee. It was my privilege to not only serve in the House of Representatives with Congressman EVERETT, but it was also my privilege to be his close neighbor in the Congressional Hotel.

Congressman EVERETT was extremely devoted to his job and no district in the country was represented by a Congressman who gave more time and energy to his constituents than did "FATS" EVERETT. Not only was he attentive to his job, but he believed in doing it to the best of his ability. And I might add, he did it well. He always worked for the things he felt were in the best interest of his district, State, and country. "FATS" was an extremely warm and friendly person, and, even during his illness, he always had a friendly hello and a big smile for everyone he met.

Congressman EVERETT's devotion to his job was exceeded only by his devotion to his mother, Mrs. Lella Ashton Everett. They were extremely close, and all of his friends here in Washington were impressed with the loving attention he gave to her. I have never known a more devoted son.

Mrs. Andrews and I extend to Mrs. Everett our sincere sympathy in her hour of sadness. She is a sweet and lovely lady, and it has also been our privilege to know her.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues in the House today to pay tribute to our late colleague, ROBERT A. EVERETT. Not only has the State of Tennessee lost a fine, able, and diligent Congressman, but the Members of the House of Representatives have lost a trusted and hardworking friend of 11 years.

As a member of the Veterans Affairs Committee with Congressman EVERETT, I was privileged to witness his dedication and efforts not only to his constituents, but also to the many veterans who called on him. His tireless application in striving for worthwhile legislation was a tribute to his success and a reason for the high esteem in which he was held.

Congressman EVERETT was a distinguished and capable legislator with a fine record of public service. He served his constituents and his country well,

always keeping their best interests in mind. His faith in the ideals upon which this country is based was always evident by his word and deed.

I extend my deepest sympathy to the family of Congressman EVERETT. He will be missed by all of us.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, with deep regret, I mark the passing of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable ROBERT A. EVERETT, of the Tennessee Eighth District, a veteran of some 10 years service in the House, and my dear and trusted friend.

As a member of the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Public Works, BOB EVERETT established himself, long ago, as a major force in the formation of policies vital to the interests of millions of Americans. In committee, on the floor, and back among his constituents, he constantly displayed the kind of energy, ability, honesty, and purpose that so thoroughly qualified him for public office. And so it was throughout his life.

From 1945 to 1949 BOB EVERETT served in Washington as administrative assistant to the Honorable Tom Stewart, U.S. Senator from Tennessee, and, from 1950 to 1952, he was administrative assistant to Gov. Gordon Browning, of Tennessee. He was executive secretary of the Tennessee County Services Association, from 1954 to 1958, and when a vacancy was created in Congress, in 1958, following the death of the Honorable Jere Cooper, of the Tennessee Eighth District, BOB EVERETT ran successfully for election to fill the vacancy. He stood for reelection five times and was invariably successful, the last time without opposition of any kind.

Major achievements marked up by BOB EVERETT during his service in Washington were numerous. He was, however, particularly proud of his contributions to flood control and water conservation. Vitally concerned about the gradual silt destruction of Redfoot Lake, in west Tennessee, he managed to secure the cooperation of State and Federal agencies in the Redfoot-Indian Creek Watershed project designed to preserve the lake.

Over the years, BOB EVERETT was one of the leaders in a campaign, in which both Tennessee and Missouri participated, for the erection of a bridge across the Mississippi River in the interest of thousands of Americans. Success came in the twilight of BOB EVERETT's life, when the project was approved by President Johnson. BOB EVERETT succeeded, in this regard, where many others previously had failed.

As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, BOB EVERETT visited many of the veterans' hospitals in the Nation, and served our country's veterans well on all occasions. Four years ago he worked successfully for the passage of a bill reopening veterans' insurance following expiration of the original time limit. He also was sponsor of a measure which has opened insurance to veterans of the war in Vietnam.

Working to the hilt, right up to the end, BOB EVERETT left a hospital bed to attend a meeting, in New Orleans, in December, of the Lower Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, and on

that occasion was elected president of the body.

He was a brilliant man, whom all regarded as an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives and a great American. His presence will be missed by all who knew him and had the great advantage of working with him in this House he loved so well.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to the memory of one of the most lovable men ever to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives. The late Representative ROBERT A. "FATS" EVERETT was a small-town product, the best of what people in the South call "good country folks." He was as friendly as a St. Bernard and as down to earth as a dirt farmer. In short, he was a great guy. And he was one of the most hard-working Members of the House. It was his habit to come in to his office at 7:30 in the morning to open his mail, and he spent long hours at his desk. BOB EVERETT dedicated his life to public service. Of him it can truly be said, the Congress was his life, and he loved it. We shall miss his friendly presence.

Mr. QUILLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply shocked and saddened at the passing of my good friend and colleague, ROBERT A. EVERETT.

I had known him for many years. Our friendship began while I was in the State Legislature in Tennessee and he was active in State government at that time. I shall not forget him, nor will anyone who ever knew him.

He was a great American, a great Tennessean, and a great Congressman. His love and devotion to his country and fellow man extend a challenge for others to follow. He was a man of deep conviction, and fought vigorously in support of his beliefs and philosophy of government, always championing the cause of the little man.

"FATS," as he was affectionately called by his colleagues and friends, had a heart of gold. He always extended a helping hand and he was proud of the people back home. He loved to represent them and to help them in every way.

As has often been said, the true measure of man can be determined by his service to others. So it is with ROBERT A. EVERETT's career. He certainly measured up—even went beyond this true measure—in his service to others.

As a valuable and senior member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the House, he always fought for the rights of all veterans of this Nation. As a veteran himself, he always handled his veterans' cases personally. He was also a powerful and valuable member of the House Public Works Committee.

His efforts for high principles were long and successful in both committees and on the floor of the House. He served with dedication and without fanfare. He worked diligently and went right to the heart of the issues involved.

Members on both sides of the aisle already miss him, for he was a friend to all. We are all appreciative of the fine contribution he made to the development and preservation of America.

My wife joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to his mother and other members of the family.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, ROBERT A. "FATS" EVERETT was my friend and I was his. During my privileged service with "Fats" in the House of Representatives, he was ever giving of his sound, practical advice and his warm, sincere strong hand was ever present and available.

His contributions to the House of Representatives will remain forever engraved on the honor roll of the great men of this Nation. Among his many talents, his storytelling, his ability to bring joy and laughter is legendary. Surely, there will be many times when we think we hear thunder from above—but instead, the noise will be a roar of laughter brought about by the presence of "FATS" as he continues to tell his humorous stories to his colleagues in heaven.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest regret that I note the passing of my friend and colleague the Honorable ROBERT EVERETT of Tennessee. It is a terrible loss to his district, the State of Tennessee, this Congress, and the Nation, as well as to myself personally.

BOB EVERETT was one of the first Members I met upon my entrance as a freshman Representative to the 86th Congress. It was a strong and enduring relationship which grew firmer over the years.

He was a great American, serving his country in the military during World War II, and as an active member of both the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs during his term here. He devoted his entire life to public service, from his initial position as an elected member and clerk of his native Obion County Court, until his untimely death while representing the people of the Eighth District of Tennessee in their National Legislature.

His accomplishments were numerous and significant and he will be sadly missed. In the forthcoming months his dynamic personality and valuable insight will be notably absent from these Halls.

To his family I extend my deepest sympathy. It was a great privilege and honor to have known him. May God rest his soul.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, all of us are grieved at the passing of our distinguished colleague, ROBERT A. EVERETT.

The Nation has lost a most dedicated servant. He served his country and his State in many important capacities and in each post officiated with distinction.

ROBERT EVERETT was a most able legislator. Measures that he sponsored will benefit all of the people of our Nation.

This great public servant was a great humanitarian. His consideration was always for the greatest good for the greatest number.

We who served with him enjoyed the friendship that he extended to us. We often turned to him for legislative guidance and he was most helpful.

For quite a period, we had adjoining offices and he indeed made a wonderful neighbor. In our almost daily conversations, I found that ROBERT EVERETT was a great patriot—one who could well rank with the founding patriots of old.

I shall long mourn his passing.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful today for the opportunity to join the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee in paying honor to our late friend and colleague, ROBERT A. "FATS" EVERETT. His sudden and untimely death has left a deep void in the House of Representatives.

I had the privilege of working with "FATS" EVERETT on the House Committee on Public Works, and I knew him to be one of the most dedicated, hard-working members of that committee. His efforts in working to improve conditions were directed to the benefit of the entire country—not just his own district, although he cared for his people and their interests with untiring zeal.

A man of amazing stature, his heart would seem to be just as large as he was—large enough to care for the problems and welfare of everyone who knew him. Often, in speaking to the people of his district, he would remark, "I will always be as near to you as your telephone or mailbox." And he kept that promise, opening his heart to all who came to him, 24 hours a day.

As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, he took a personal interest in the facilities and opportunities available to our veterans. Frequently he made personal visits to VA hospitals, and fought to improve the care and conditions therein.

The loss of this great man is not only a personal loss to me—it is a tragedy that will affect the entire House of Representatives. We will all remember his tremendous energy, his constant good cheer, and his deep devotion to his people. These memories will keep him alive in the minds and hearts of his colleagues for a long time to come.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, with the untimely passing of one of our most beloved colleagues—the late Representative ROBERT A. EVERETT, of Tennessee, his native State and the Nation lost a great and good man.

Known as "the biggest man in the House" because of his large frame, cowboy hats and boots, he was affectionately called "Fats" by his countless friends. He was a jolly person who loved humor and people. He once said that one of his great pleasures of serving in Congress was that it put him in a position to do things for people.

To do things for others, to help his constituents was his constant aim ever since he filled the unexpired term of the late Representative Jere Cooper after a special election on February 1, 1958. "Fats" served with distinction and the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee turned to him for such services and help that a Congressman can render. Because of his membership on the House Public Works Committee, he was able to insure that his district would obtain its fair share of Federal projects. He was particularly interested in flood control and played a vital role in connection with the establishment of the Reelfoot-Indian Creek Watershed District.

Our late colleague was one of the leaders in the efforts to have a bridge constructed across the Mississippi River to serve west Tennessee and eastern Mis-

souri. His efforts met with success only a short time prior to "FATS" EVERETT's passing when President Johnson signed the bill for its construction. I note with considerable satisfaction that a bill was introduced to name this bridge the "Robert A. Everett Memorial Bridge" in his honor.

A true American patriot in the best tradition of his "Volunteer State" of Tennessee, he enlisted in the Army after the bombing of Pearl Harbor and served several years in the Armed Forces of our country. His interest in our men in uniform led to his assignment to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee where he gave this committee the benefit of his experience and deep concern for his fellow serviceman.

The records of the Congress bear testimony to his accomplishments. To say we shall miss him is an understatement for few men have the warmth and humility coupled with ability that "FATS" had. To those he left behind and to his devoted followers and friends we express our deepest sympathy, for to have known him was to have loved him and I am proud to have served with him and enjoyed his friendship for 10 years.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart I rise today to pay tribute to a dear friend and colleague, the late ROBERT A. EVERETT, of Tennessee.

I knew ROBERT EVERETT from the day he first arrived in this body in February of 1958 until his untimely passing. I served with him not only as a Member of this body but as a fellow member of the Committee on Public Works. BOB EVERETT brought to his task as a Member of Congress and as a member of the Committee on Public Works a dedication and devotion to those principles of government he felt would be best for the welfare of this Nation he loved. He was a warm, lovable human being and he combined with this an ability to express clearly and succinctly his position on all those matters that were important to his district, his State, and his country. Throughout his service in the Congress of the United States and as a member of the Committee on Public Works he was one of those Members who quietly and effectively pushed forward legislation that would be helpful to all. He served with distinction as a member of the Subcommittees on Rivers and Harbors, Flood Control, Roads and the Federal-Aid Highway Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works.

He devoted his entire career to the public service of his country, State, and Nation, moving from a member of the county court in his immediate area to a position as a Representative in the Congress for the Eighth District of Tennessee. Throughout this period he was always the same—easy-going and affable—a man who had thousands of friends and no enemies. He was known throughout the length and breadth of his State and the lower Mississippi area. At the time of his death he had just assumed the presidency of the Lower Mississippi Valley Association, an organization dedicated to the full-scale development of the entire region BOB EVERETT served.

I will miss him, and I know we all

will. As we move through life there are many, many people who cross our paths but few who leave that firm, indelible impression that goes with a real man and a real individual. Such a person was ROBERT A. EVERETT.

Mrs. Fallon and I extend our deepest sympathy to his beloved mother, Mrs. Lella Ashton Everett, on this sad occasion.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to join with our colleagues this afternoon in paying heartfelt respect to the memory of a great gentleman, the late "FATS" EVERETT. It was my distinct pleasure to have served in the body with "FATS" for 4 years. He was a mountain of a man in more than physical stature, for he had a heart and a compassion to match his size.

I spent many enjoyable hours conferring with "FATS" on problems of mutual interest and I never knew him to be anything but understanding and warm. I shall miss his friendship, his counsel, his jovial wit. Tennessee has lost one of her ablest legislators, and the House one of its finest Members.

My deepest sympathies go out to "FATS" family.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in the House in paying tribute to the late Representative ROBERT EVERETT, whose tragic death on January 26 has so saddened us all. To thousands of his friends and constituents in Tennessee, Representative EVERETT was the best Congressman the Eighth District ever had, and maybe the best Congressman in the country. He loved people, and he spent his whole life serving others—as a teacher, a youth leader, a city and county official, and finally as a Member of Congress.

ROBERT EVERETT grew up amid the rich pioneer heritage of rural Tennessee. He had a farmer's respect for the worth and dignity of every individual, the zest for life spiced with sometimes irreverent but always irrepressible wit and humor, and also a farmer's intensely practical and realistic focus on the problems of life. All of these talents combined to make him a successful political leader.

At Murray State in Kentucky, where he graduated in 1936, he was already a popular student leader and an enthusiastic participant in local politics. Returning to his home in Obion County, he became a teacher and won his first election as a member of the Obion County Court. In 1938 he was elected circuit court clerk.

When the war came, Congressman EVERETT wanted desperately to serve in the Armed Forces. But the Army turned him down when he sought to enlist. Representative EVERETT was such an obviously sincere and dedicated patriot, however, that the Army was persuaded to take him and even had special uniforms made to fit his tremendous frame.

Congressman EVERETT acquired a wealth of invaluable political experience in the years following World War II. After his release from the Armed Forces he served as administrative assistant to Senator Tom Stewart. In 1950 he became administrative assistant to Gov. Gordon Browning. He also spent 4 years as executive

secretary of the Tennessee County Services Association. In each of these posts he earned the respect and admiration of his friends and colleagues for his ability to "go to the head of the stream" to get things done, and for his willingness to tackle any problem, great or small, to help someone in need.

You did not have to be wealthy or important or to have "pull" to see Congressman EVERETT. His door was always open, and he always had a sympathetic ear for the problems of the little man, the ordinary man—his people. He got just as much pleasure out of the small favors he was able to do for thousands of individuals as for the very big achievements that benefited his whole district, and hence, the State of Tennessee.

The contribution that Congressman EVERETT made to the Eighth District through his membership on the House Committees on Public Works and Veterans' Affairs was very great. The roads, hospitals, schools, flood control, and water resource conservation projects which he initiated or rescued from governmental redtape will remain as an imperishable monument to his memory.

More than these accomplishments, however, the most enduring memorial to Congressman EVERETT will be the place he built in the hearts of thousands of constituents whose first names he always remembered, those who will never forget him as long as they live. He was a true and loyal friend to all who knew him. He will be remembered with respect and affection, and he will be missed terribly.

To the bereaved mother of Representative EVERETT I extend my deepest sorrow and sympathy.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to speak of our colleague, ROBERT ASHTON EVERETT, as if he were gone.

He was so active and full of life. He was so considerate of others and always willing to shoulder more than his share of the load.

It was my great pleasure to know and work with ROBERT EVERETT during most of the last 22 years.

I met him when I first came to Congress and he was an aide to Senator Tom Stewart of Tennessee. He continued his public service as administrative assistant to the Governor of his State and then as executive secretary of the Tennessee County Services Association.

On his election to the Congress, more than 11 years ago, our association increased, and I became even more aware of his great unselfishness and untiring helpfulness to others whether colleagues or constituents.

As members of the Public Works Committee, we served together on several subcommittees.

He distinguished himself with his thoughtful and worthwhile contributions to the great work of improving this Nation. He displayed a particular interest in the development of water resources projects for the benefit of all the people of the United States.

He was a dedicated and conscientious member of the Flood Control Subcommittee who could be counted on for knowledgeable advocacy of work to

properly manage our vital water resources.

ROBERT EVERETT's labors for his country were equaled by his strong sense of responsibility to his constituents. Although seriously ill in the last few months, he carried on his work in behalf of his constituents through correspondence and constant telephone calls.

The universal esteem and high regard of our colleague by the people he served was evidenced by the fact that he was reelected last year without opposition. It is my hope that his gracious and beloved mother can find some consolation in knowing that he lived a useful life, devoted to helping others. The world is certainly a better place for his having been among us.

He was such a wonderful and considerate friend that we shall all miss him very much.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, on January 26 we, in the House of Representatives, suffered the loss of one of our most beloved and respected colleagues in the untimely passing of the Honorable ROBERT A. EVERETT, of Tennessee.

"FATS" EVERETT, as he was known affectionately since boyhood, served his country and his constituents of the Eighth Congressional District of northwestern Tennessee with loyalty and dedication. By virtue of his membership on the Public Works Committee he played a major role in securing numerous flood control projects for his people. He served on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs throughout his entire House tenure, and our veterans had no better friend than this fine gentleman who worked unceasingly to bring about the enactment of legislation to benefit our older veterans as well as countless more to come in the years ahead.

"FATS" EVERETT was a good friend of mine and I shall always consider it a privilege and a pleasure to have served with him in the House. He loved people and, in turn, was loved by them. Indeed it can be said of him that it was not possible to meet "FATS" EVERETT and fail to like him immensely and I am confident that he had as many friends as any single Member in the House.

The problems of his constituents became his problems and his realistic and direct approach enabled him to accomplish much for the benefit of many during his relatively short span of life.

The influence of this servant of the people will be felt for many generations to come because the efforts and example of men of ROBERT EVERETT's caliber are not quickly forgotten.

My heartfelt sympathy is with Mrs. Lella Ashton Everett in the loss of her beloved son and it is my prayer that she is comforted by an abundance of Divine assistance during these difficult days.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish on this day, to join my colleagues in tribute to a fine gentleman and Member of Congress, ROBERT A. EVERETT.

Mr. EVERETT on February 1 would have completed one full decade of dedicated service to the Nation and the people of the Eighth District of Tennessee. The confidence shown him by the voters of his district is ample recognition of his fine work in Congress.

We who worked with him knew very well the thoughtful, hardworking approach he took to the problems confronting the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, his absence here will be significant.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is always difficult to put into words what we feel when we lose an old and valued friend, and "FATS" EVERETT was a valued friend as well as a respected colleague. It was a real pleasure to work with him, both here in the House and on the Public Works Committee. He was a good companion, and an honest man, intensely loyal to his country and his constituents and his beliefs. He served all three well, with ability and without pretense. If that can be fairly said of those of us he leaves behind when our service is ended, we will be fortunate men.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we turn from our legislative duties and pay tribute to the life and character of our departed colleague, ROBERT A. EVERETT.

"FATS" was one of the most likable individuals I have ever met. There was nothing artificial about him as he always exhibited warmth and good humor.

In many fine ways, "FATS" personified our representative form of government. He knew his district and its people and competently translated their views and opinions into legislative action.

Tennessee and the Nation have lost a valuable public servant. The Members of this body have each lost a friend.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today in expressing grief at the passing of a good friend and colleague, the Honorable ROBERT A. EVERETT, of Tennessee.

I came to know "FATS" EVERETT, as he was affectionately known, when I came to Congress 10 years ago and we were both assigned to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

He was an active and conscientious member of our committee, and I shall miss his comradeship and his good humor in our future sessions of the committee. He was a veteran of World War II and was sympathetic, in a realistic manner, to the needs of our Nation's veterans.

The Nation, and in particular the Eighth Congressional District in Tennessee, has lost a dedicated public servant, and each of us has lost a true friend and colleague.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, all of us who knew and served with him entertained a great affection for the Honorable ROBERT A. EVERETT, of Tennessee. Above all, he was an intelligent, warm, understanding human being. To him there was no such thing as a stranger because all with whom he came in contact were speedily engaged in friendly, informal conversation.

He was diligent in representing his constituents and always had their views and well-being in mind. Having served with him on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I am particularly aware of the responsibility that he assumed in the day by day work of the Congress. He was conscientious and effective. When "FATS" EVERETT told you that he was for or against a proposal, you knew that was

exactly the way it was and did not worry about a constant change of position.

He was a fine citizen, a great American, and a dedicated legislator. We shall all miss him.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I first want to compliment my dear friend and colleague Congressman JOE EVINS of Tennessee for taking this time to pay tribute to the memory and work of one of the greatest Americans that it has ever been my privilege to know. ROBERT "FATS" EVERETT was a real gentleman, outstanding Congressman for his district, and a great national legislator.

I well recall many important meetings of the House Committee on Public Works on which we both served, that he was a great force for compromise and his beaming personality was a great contributing factor in helping solve seemingly insurmountable legislative obstacles.

"FATS" EVERETT had a great common bond with his people. They loved him as we did. He had the true Tennessee heritage of faith and courage and a will steered for accomplishment. His vitality caught the imagination of many people. In good times and bad, "FATS" walked among the citizens with great concern for their welfare, but everlasting hope for the future.

Those of us who mourn "FATS" passing must raise our eyes beyond the boundaries of his congressional service and realize that his district in Tennessee and, yes, the Nation will be better because he came our way.

I want to offer my sincere condolences to his loving mother and I know she will take comfort in the fact that her illustrious son was well loved by all.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our beloved and much lamented colleague, ROBERT A. "FATS" EVERETT, was one of the truly great Congressmen it has been my privilege to know. I knew him well. For many years we served on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and on the Public Works Committee. During his service on the Veterans' Affairs Committee, more legislation was passed benefiting the veterans, their widows and orphans, than any other period in the history of our country. "FATS" EVERETT's service on the Veterans' Affairs Committee was truly the "era of the veteran."

On the Public Works Committee, Congressman EVERETT was one of the leaders in promoting some of the most beneficial legislation to the people of our country in modern times. The Appalachia program, economic development, and improvement of our rivers and harbors were constantly on his mind. Our superb Interstate Highway System and pure water received his constant attention.

"FATS" EVERETT was a national Congressman. Yes, he represented his district ably and well, but he was devoted and dedicated to the welfare of our entire Nation. This Nation is a better place, and the cause of freedom more secure throughout the world due to the service of this great American. Congressman EVERETT came here as secretary to Senator Tom Stewart and was well-known and beloved on both sides of the Capitol and both sides of the aisle. He loved the people whom he represented and maintained a constant contact with them. He

had an attentive ear for their grievances. He maintained communication with his people—all of them. He once told me that he checked every piece of mail personally that came into his office and that he signed the replies personally. He was an ideal Representative. He was likable, jovial, and colorful; and the committees will not be the same without him. He was my warm personal friend. He was devoted to his mother. She is a great lady in the traditions of courtesy, good manners, and womanhood, as exemplified by the women of the Southland.

Mrs. Dorn and my family join me in extending to this noble lady, and to Congressman EVERETT's people whom he so ably represented, our deepest and most heartfelt sympathy always.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great honor to have this opportunity to say a few words in tribute for a friend and colleague whose recent death is a tragedy not only for his family and friends, but for his State and the Nation.

ROBERT A. EVERETT served in Congress and on the Veterans' Affairs Committee for 11 years. For the past 6 years I have had the honor and good fortune to serve on that committee with him. I always found him to be a good and genial friend. His work in Congress and on the Veterans' Affairs Committee stands as a memorial to his life as no eulogy ever could.

His diligent work on behalf of the welfare of our Nation's veterans has had many a salutary effect. His particular area of interest was always medical care for veterans and it is in that area especially that the Nation benefited from his dedication. His influence has been felt on more legislation than it is possible to mention. Today there are literally thousands of veterans who, perhaps unknowingly, reap the benefits of his good work. ROBERT A. EVERETT could have no more fitting memorial.

We who know him and worked with him will miss his good counsel and tireless efforts.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our good friend, ROBERT A. EVERETT, of Tennessee. He was a statesman as well as an eminent, faithful, and able servant of his district and of his State. Without a doubt, he was one of the most respected Members on either side of the aisle. Having had the pleasure of serving with Mr. EVERETT on the Public Works Committee. I can especially note the dedication and zeal that marked his work. On the committee, he and I were the junior members of our respective parties, and because of our seating arrangement, I had the opportunity to enjoy "FATS'" keen sense of humor as we conducted the business of the committee.

The shock of his death fills me with a deep sense of loss of a fine friend. Mrs. Miller joins me in extending our deepest sympathy to the family of Mr. EVERETT.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, to eulogize our beloved colleague from Tennessee, the Honorable ROBERT A. EVERETT, is to pay respect to a man of more than imposing physical dimensions. "FATS" EVERETT, as he was affectionately known, had other attributes for which he will always be remembered. His legislative

ability, his love of life, his dedicated service to the public interest were qualities of his that were as equally as imposing as his large physical stature.

BOB EVERETT, it can be said, grew up on Capitol Hill. Working as a congressional staff member before his election to the House, "FATS" EVERETT learned his lesson well because he became one of the House's most effective Members, assuring his constituents of the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee of able and skilled representation. There was a period in his life when he was a frequent visitor to the National Stock Yards at East St. Louis. He had many close friends there. They are among the many who mourn his loss.

It is not an easy task to talk of the beloved "FATS" EVERETT in the past tense because he was a man of such vitality and energy. But our fond memories of his daily presence among us for so many years will ease the pain we feel with his loss.

As we pay tribute to this fine man, I want to convey my sincere sympathies to his mother to whom he was so deeply devoted.

MR. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the late and lamented ROBERT EVERETT was one of the most affable and congenial Members who has served here. At the same time, he was deeply devoted to the well-being of the country and its institutions. He was a patriot who always put the country ahead of partisanship. In all his service he displayed commendable courage and understanding.

BOB EVERETT will be missed. He served his country well. He commanded respect and he was favored with many friendships. To the surviving members of his family I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

MR. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the House Members in paying our respects today to our late colleague, the Honorable ROBERT A. EVERETT, of Tennessee. "FATS," as he was affectionately called, was known and loved by us all. His passing was a great sorrow and those of us who witnessed his daily battle with ill health knew of his courageous struggle against its ravages. Yet, he valiantly joined his colleagues in Washington to be sworn in as a Member of this 91st Congress before making his final journey home. He would not have wanted it any other way, though the pain of that last trip was evident. "FATS" EVERETT was a man of towering size and character. He took immeasurable pride in his representation of the Eighth District of Tennessee, and he unfailingly served his constituency well. I was privileged to serve with "Fats" on the House Public Works Committee in the 89th and 90th Congresses. As the ranking minority member of this committee, I am pressing for early approval of the resolution to name a bridge now under construction near Dyersburg, Tenn., the "Robert A. Everett Memorial Bridge." This act on our part will in a small way be our tribute to a man who was large among us. "FATS" and I occupied neighboring offices when we first moved into the Rayburn Building. His booming hello and his hearty grin brought a most welcome lightheartedness into the oftentimes heavy

legislative days. His outgoing cheer and good will were his distinctive personality traits, and he always seemed to have them with him, fair weather or foul. His joy of living brightened the lives of all of us who were privileged to know "FATS" EVERETT. The sorrow of his passing is felt by us all.

MR. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, this is an occasion of real sorrow. The death of ROBERT A. "FATS" EVERETT took away a valued friend. This tragedy struck just as he was heading into what should have been the most valuable and productive years of his life. Enriched by experience and rising in rank he was a steadily growing force in the House and in the country. He served on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and was a colleague of mine on the Public Works Committee, and on the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program. "FATS" EVERETT watched and participated in the growth of our great Interstate Highway System. I welcomed his counsel and his friendship in this work and the other work of our committee. His death is a personal loss to me and a great loss to his constituents and to the country. He will be sorely missed in these Halls.

I extend my deepest sympathies to his family.

MR. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I sadly add my voice to those of my colleagues in paying tribute to the late ROBERT A. EVERETT, of Tennessee, whose passing is mourned by all who were privileged to serve with him in these Chambers. All who knew him will miss "Fats," as he was affectionately known, for despite his illness he always had a world of cheer for others. I recall how he moved all who were present to laughter, when at one of the subcommittee meetings over which he presided he just could not pronounce my last name right, although I repeated it three times for him. He finally gave up and said, "Dammit, SPARKY, I can never pronounce your name right." So I responded by saying, "I'll admit that 'MATSUNAGA' is a little more difficult than 'FATS.'" His booming laughter lifted the rafters of the hearing room.

A truly great American, "FATS" EVERETT fought hard for the principles in which he believed since February 1, 1958, when he was elected to fill the unexpired term of his predecessor in the 85th Congress.

His family and host of friends can find a measure of comfort in his notable accomplishments as a Congressman. He was indeed a man who, while living, had earned the respect and affection of his colleagues.

In the death of "FATS" EVERETT the Nation has suffered a great loss, but it would have been an even greater loss had not this Congress known and felt the presence of this man. Today, our Nation is a better place because of his contributions.

Together with the members of this House, I mourn "FATS" EVERETT's passing, and I would like to take this opportunity to express my deepest sympathy to the members of his family who survive him.

MR. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, over the years I have known ROBERT EVERETT, I have known also the people of his dis-

trict. For several years we were neighbors in the Congressional Hotel.

It is hard to believe that any Member of Congress could be more beloved by his constituents than was "FATS," as we affectionately called him. His service to the Congress was classic. He truly understood the meaning of the word "representation." No congressional district has had better representation in Washington than the Eighth District of Tennessee. His willingness to help his colleagues with their problems, his energetic efforts to assist the service veterans of our country were indeed characteristic of the man.

I wish to share with my colleagues the sympathy and respect which we all extend to his family, his friends, and his constituents. We have indeed lost more than a colleague, we have lost a great personal friend.

MR. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly saddened at the untimely passing of my friend and colleague, the late ROBERT A. "FATS" EVERETT. The State of Tennessee and the whole Nation have lost a devoted and effective public servant in the death of this great man.

Known to his numerous friends as "FATS," BOB EVERETT was indeed a dedicated, hard-working Congressman. His many accomplishments as a Member of this body will benefit Americans for many years to come. The void left in this House by his passing will not be filled easily.

It was my great privilege to enjoy a warm friendship with BOB EVERETT. He was always willing to assist and counsel with his many personal friends about any matter, and cheer them with his humorous stories. I shall certainly miss and mourn him, and I would like to extend my heartfelt sympathy to his revered mother, Mrs. Lelia Ashton Everett, in her great loss.

MR. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today to pay tribute to "FATS" EVERETT. I do so with mixed emotions, Mr. Speaker. I am sad because he is no longer with us and we mourn his loss as we humans will, but then how can anyone who knew "Fats" ever be sad when remembering him, for it was not his nature to be sad, and it rubbed off; it was catching; I would say it was highly contagious. You just felt good and happy all over when he would walk up to you with his hand outstretched and say, "Lord o' mercy, how in the world are you?"

He was a great Member of Congress, Mr. Speaker. He represented his district ably and with distinction.

If there was ever a man who never met a stranger, "FATS" was he. You could see, hear, and feel him down that main street; he knew everyone and he loved everyone he knew.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we all lost a great deal, for his passing was a loss to his family, his district, his State, his country, and indeed, the human race, for we do not have too many like him. My sincere and heartfelt sympathy is extended to his family and the people of his district and my life will be richer and I will appreciate forever the great privilege of having been numbered among his friends.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sadness that I have learned of the passing of Congressman ROBERT A. EVERETT, of the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee. BOB EVERETT was one of the most likable and personable individuals which I have had the privilege of meeting since coming to the Congress in 1962.

Congressman EVERETT was never reluctant to involve himself in the controversial issues coming before the Congress and his participation in floor debates was always constructive and effective.

As a fellow Member who was privileged to serve with Congressman BOB EVERETT for the past 6 years, I am proud to pay this final tribute to his memory and to extend to his mother and other members of his family my heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the others of this House in a final farewell and tribute to our beloved and now departed colleague, the Honorable ROBERT A. EVERETT.

ROBERT EVERETT was known far and wide, to his constituents at home and his colleagues here, as "FATS" EVERETT. In fact, he insisted on being addressed by that nickname, which, in many ways was appropriate.

He was a huge man, to be sure. And when he entered an elevator, especially one of the more ancient ones still in use in these halls, you knew he was aboard.

But I have strong feelings, based on my service here with "FATS" EVERETT, that his nickname conveyed a meaning of much more than just his physical size.

One of the meanings of "fat" which can be found in a dictionary is "containing something valuable in great quantity."

This, I think, is the other side of "FATS" EVERETT and his nickname.

"In great quantity" certainly was the measure of his friendship, love, and understanding for his fellow man and his dedication to the service of his people.

His reservoir of good will and good humor was equally measurable in "great quantity." So was his devotion to his family, his district, his State, and his country.

We will miss "FATS" EVERETT in this House. We already have. I extend my deepest sympathy to his mother during her hours of sorrow on his untimely passing. We are all the better for having known him.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to have the opportunity to join my colleagues and attempt to express what is on our hearts as we honor the memory of our departed colleague, ROBERT A. "FATS" EVERETT.

I am sure that all of us on both sides of the aisle would agree that there was not a more popular or better liked Member of this body than "FATS" EVERETT. He possessed a keen wit, a wonderful sense of humor and a deep compassion for his fellow man.

His congressional district, the State of Tennessee, and the Nation will all keenly feel his loss.

I want to extend my personal condolences to the members of his family and our thanks to them for having permitted us the benefit of his presence in the House of Representatives for 12 years.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to my very close friend, the late ROBERT A. EVERETT, of Tennessee.

Mr. EVERETT, a Member of this body since 1958, represented the Eighth District of Tennessee and at the time of his death was a ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and the Public Works Committee.

For many years, ROBERT EVERETT and I stayed at the same hotel. It was during this period that I came to know him and develop a high personal regard for his integrity, intelligence, perseverance, and good fellowship. His passing is a great loss not only to Tennessee but to the United States.

I join in expressing my deepest sympathies to his mother and his many friends.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly saddened at the untimely passing of my friend and colleague, the late ROBERT A. "FATS" EVERETT. The State of Tennessee and the whole Nation have lost a devoted and effective public servant in the death of this great man.

Known to his numerous friends as "FATS," BOB EVERETT was indeed a dedicated, hard-working Congressman. His service as a Member of this body has benefited all Americans. The void left in this body by his passing will not be easily filled.

It was my privilege to enjoy a warm friendship with BOB EVERETT. He was always willing to assist and counsel with his many personal friends about many matters of which he had great knowledge. His personality was sufficient to cheer all of those with whom he came in contact. I shall miss "FATS," my personal friend, and I want to extend my heartfelt sympathy to his revered mother Mrs. Lelia Ashton Everett, in her hour of sorrow and great loss. My prayers are that our Heavenly Father will sustain her at this time of distress.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives, the State of Tennessee, and the Nation suffered a great loss when our colleague, Congressman ROBERT A. "FATS" EVERETT, passed away on January 26.

As a member of the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Public Works, he contributed greatly to programs which vitally affected the welfare of our Nation. I was privileged to serve with him on the Committee on Public Works and I was very much impressed with his legislative ability and his concern for the welfare of our Nation and its people.

"FATS" was a warm, gracious, generous person who merited everyone's respect and admiration. His good humor and warm greetings brightened so many hours of our lives. But most of all it was his stature as a person that will be long remembered.

Mrs. Johnson joins me in extending deepest sympathy to his mother, to whom "FATS" was so devoted, and to his relatives in their bereavement.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, with a great deal of sadness I join my colleagues today in paying tribute to the late Honorable ROBERT A. EVERETT, who, for a little more than 10 years, ably represented the people of Tennessee's Eighth Congressional District.

BOB EVERETT, or "FATS" as his friends here affectionately called him, will be sorely missed by all of us for he was a warm, simple, and gifted man proud of a country heritage who was above all a dedicated and sincere servant of the people of his State and district. We shall all miss his humor, booming voice and so human mannerisms. To his mother I extend my deepest sympathy.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in eulogy of "FATS" EVERETT, of Tennessee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY—51 YEARS OF RESISTANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the 51st anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Lithuanian people. On November 15, 1917, the Soviet Government under Lenin declared that all the nations of Russia had the right of self-determination, including independence and the formation of sovereign governments. On February 16, 1918, the Lithuanian Council, speaking for all of the people of Lithuania, declared the nation an independent, democratically ordered state. But Lithuania is still not free.

The roots of the Lithuanian independent spirit reach deep into the history of this Baltic nation. During the second half of the 14th century, vast empires were being built by powerful lords who conquered great expanses of land and established dynasties. By the mid-15th century, the Lithuanian empire extended over 300,000 square miles, stretching south from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea and east almost to Moscow, an area larger than any country in modern Europe. The ruling classes managed to control this vast territory because of their unquestionable political talent and their spirit of religious tolerance. Lithuania at that time was a proud and powerful multinational state and the Baltic peoples who inhabited the land were intensely nationalistic, proud of their religion, language, and customs.

The struggle of these proud peoples to maintain their freedom began in the 16th century when the Russian rulers in Moscow proclaimed themselves czars of all the Russians and began to sweep across the surrounding nations. Russian invasions of Lithuania began in the 17th century and continued for over 100 years, culminating finally in the fall of Vilnius, the capital, during the second invasion in 1721. Her gallant citizens had fought vehemently, but finally the Russian empire proved the stronger. Thus, the inherent right of mankind to liberty and with it man's sense of human dignity

were shut in darkness. For the 120 years of the czarist occupation, endless attempts were made to break down the nationalistic spirit of the Lithuanian people in favor of a stronger feeling of oneness with the Russian empire. During these dark times, Lithuanian schools were closed; the land was seized and put in the hands of Russian landlords; Lithuanian language and literature were outlawed; the press became Russian dominated, its principal purpose to spread Russian nationalist propaganda throughout the land; the people's religion was persecuted, and even the name of this once proud state was abolished, the Russians referring to their newest colony as the "territory of the Northwest."

In 1917, Woodrow Wilson's words expressing the right of all peoples to self-determination gave voice to the hopes of the Lithuanians, and the demand for independence, for liberty, flared anew. Throughout the horrors of the German occupation and World War I, Lithuanian statesmen strove for independence, leading delegation after delegation first to Berlin, later to Moscow demanding the right of self-government. On February 16, 1918, at Vilnius, the people of Lithuania declared themselves free.

It was necessary at once for the fledgling government to prove its mettle, for Bolshevik and German eyes were upon Lithuanian soil as fat enrichment of their empires. However, the people had savored the sweet joy of liberty and intended to make it last. In 1921, the country took a proud place as member of the League of Nations in status equal to every other European country, and by 1922, she had been recognized as a sovereign State by all of the major powers of the world. Lithuania was to enjoy 22 years of growth, prosperity, and freedom.

During this consummate period in Lithuanian history, the citizens proved what an energetic and dedicated people they are, for they put themselves to work building the government structure and attacking the problems which must be surmounted to make a sovereign state a great nation. Much had to be done to erase the Russian foundations set up during the 120 years' colonization. Lithuanian spirit ardently burst forth across the land, patriotically, eager to rebuild the Lithuanian homeland. Various social reforms were initiated, new elementary and secondary schools were established as well as vocational schools and many fine colleges. Existing networks of transportation were improved and new ones constructed, and attempts were made to augment industry. As a major step toward a flourishing economy, the people made the most of their greatest asset, the fertile soil, by inaugurating land reforms, establishing new farms, and teaching improved farming techniques. Agricultural exports increased rapidly and the Lithuanian economy began to boom.

Suddenly across the landscape of this rapidly growing and thriving country fell the shadow of the terrifying specter of imperialism. In 1939 the European nations began to comprehend that a massive militant German state, ready to march on sovereign nations, was threat-

ening their liberty. At this time, the Soviet Union began embroiling the Lithuanian Government in complicated diplomatic maneuvers and mutual assistance pacts with hidden strings attached. Soviet armed forces were sent to occupy the country for the purpose of thwarting the Nazi invaders and "protecting" the naive Lithuanian nation. Germany attacked the Soviet Union in 1941 and hapless Lithuania fell to the Nazi.

Then followed the bloodiest period in Lithuanian history. Free men will never fully understand the torments which the terrified people endured during the Nazi invasion and the ensuing Soviet occupation. Under the Soviets, hundreds of thousands of people were rounded up and deported to Soviet camps in Siberia. Thousands more were murdered as political enemies. Hitler's policy of conquering and colonizing resulted in more mass executions and inconceivable abuses to the Lithuanian people. As the Nazi onslaught subsided and the German armies fell back, the Soviet Army moved in to occupy Lithuanian territory again, this time under the noble pretense of freeing the worker and the peasant. Soviet subversion begun in 1939 now showed its strength. The Lithuanian people, who had been terrorized by Nazi power and confused by Soviet pressures for union in complex assistance treaties, had been the victims of skilled subversive tactics. Under the guise of protecting the country against the Nazi invaders, the Soviets had managed to implant Communist rule in every corner of Lithuania, and their lethal subterfuge had undermined the structure of the Lithuanian state. Expulsion of the Soviets after World War II was hopeless. Thus, the gallant citizens once more fell under the yoke of oppression.

The story does not end here; indeed, the courageous resistance of the Lithuanians to Sovietization goes on today in the same way it did during the first Russian occupation under the Czars. The people of Lithuania living today have known freedom; although they have suffered the bitterness of Russian tyranny, they have also tasted the sweet fruits of liberty. Remembrance of their great history and their once proud moment of independence has kept alive their hope of self-determination. Every effort is made to install in the youth this same feeling of pride in the past and determination to achieve liberty in the future. Freedom's spirit endures.

On this 51st anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence, as we pause to honor the brave Lithuanians, let us consider the words of Nadas Rastenis, Lithuanian-born poet and now U.S. citizen:

For brutal brawls and wicked wars,
All men are blamable, of course,
No King, no ruler, ever could
Disrupt the tranquil brotherhood
Of men and nations on this Sphere,
If mortals, honest and sincere—
The men who think, the men who slave,
Would rise united, peaceful, brave . . .

Mr. Speaker, the people of Lithuania will again be free.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, within the last few days, many of us have been reminded of the 51st anniversary of Lith-

uanian Independence Day, which we observed on February 16. As we pause each year in solemn tribute to the silent and subjugated status of 3 million of our fellow human beings, we offer hope, not despair, and faith, not resignation. Each of us knows that words are only symbols with which we can communicate our concern. Words, I regret to say, do not provide the Lithuanian people with the self-determination and dignity which all men deserve and seek.

For 20 years Lithuania knew peace and independence. During this period, there was a great renaissance of national literature and culture. No nation has ever demonstrated its capacity and ability for self-government more than Lithuania. Its civic leaders brought about long-needed land reformation, created and expanded industry, established an adequate transportation system, and enacted social legislation and an educational policy which could well be copied by other nations throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, Lithuania is not merely a captive nation. It is a daily reminder of the fact that we are living in an epoch in which one evil leads inexorably to another. We cannot forget Lithuania, because to do so might allow us to fall victim to the other horrors which lie before us in this unhappy century.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues today in honoring the 51st anniversary of Lithuanian independence. The stoutheartedness of these people to maintain their individual freedom, despite their subjection to Soviet occupation for almost 30 years, is truly an inspiration to us all.

The events of last year in Czechoslovakia, however, point up that we cannot stop for even a moment in our fight to preserve the rights of all those who wish to be free. As a nation founded on the struggle for independence, we must serve as an inspiration and an example of what is right and good in this struggle. It is time to rededicate ourselves and double our efforts to work to free the Lithuanians so that the life they began 51 years ago in such hope may again be a reality for them.

Americans of Lithuanian extraction are among our most patriotic and industrious citizens. Let us join with them in the hope that they may again see their homeland enjoy its independence.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 51st anniversary of the independence of Lithuania. This Baltic nation has been known to history since 1009 A.D. Of its important role during the Middle Ages one scholar has written:

The Lithuanians furnished a power and a government behind which the Eastern Slavs could live in peace and safety with a freedom that was unknown in Moscovite Russia.

In 1795, Lithuania was annexed by Russia with the tsarist government attempting to replace Lithuanian language and culture with Russian. The Lithuanians resisted, and remained faithful to their religion, language and traditions. Russian domination ended when Lithuania was overrun by German armies during World War I. The defeat of Germany coupled with the revolution in Russia rendered conditions favorable for Lithuanian independence. In 1917 a con-

gress was gathered which proposed an independent Lithuania, based on ethnographical frontiers, and elected a 20-member council. On February 16, 1918, the council proclaimed an independent Lithuanian state based on democratic principles. Lithuania was accorded recognition and admitted to the League of Nations on September 22, 1921.

During the period of independence, great emphasis was placed on improving agriculture and a land reform program was instituted. Progress was made in social legislation, with a labor control law, introduction of the 8-hour day and various other social measures. Lithuanian literature flourished. Writers found inspiration in the national folklore of Lithuania, and achievements were made in opera and music.

With the outbreak of the Second World War, Lithuania was one of the first countries to experience the aggression of both Hitler and the Soviet Union. The Soviets occupied the nation both before and after the Germans had invaded it. Although Lithuania is considered by the Soviet Union today as a component republic of the U.S.S.R., the United States has never recognized its Soviet incorporation. America has not forgotten this nation, and Americans support the Lithuanian people's just aspirations for political, religious, and cultural freedom. We hope that the goal of Lithuanian national self-determination will ultimately be realized.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1969, Lithuanians throughout the world observed the 51st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. Unfortunately this was a comparatively short-lived independence as the Soviet troops occupied and overran that territory in 1940. Following the German attack on the Soviet Union 10 months later, Lithuania was in Nazi hands until reoccupied by the Soviet Army in 1944.

It is a fact that the people of Lithuania are not and would never become a part of the Soviet Union by choice. Since those days, Lithuanians have not known freedom and happiness. Many have been deprived of necessities and have been enslaved; they have also been deprived of free elections.

Lithuanians throughout the world have not given up hope that once again their nation will walk among the free countries of the world.

Mr. Speaker, let us not forget that the United States continues to recognize the sovereignty of Lithuania and her sister Baltic States, and that it has never recognized the alien subjugation of these nations.

I take this occasion to congratulate my fellow Americans of Lithuanian heritage who have contributed so greatly to the growth and progress of our country.

I sincerely hope we shall soon see the day when we can celebrate this Lithuanian Independence Day with the knowledge that freedom and self-determination have been returned to that valiant nation.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on this 51st anniversary of the establishment of Lithuania as a democratic and sovereign state, we pay honor and tribute to a gallant people who have won

wide respect and admiration. It was 51 years ago, on February 16, 1918, when the people of Lithuania proclaimed the restoration of their independence after centuries of Russian rule.

For 22 years they enjoyed a happy, free and democratic way of life. Then, on June 15, 1940, Lithuania was again invaded by Russia—a ruthless, Communist Russia—which used strong arm methods to take over this and other small Eastern European nations and incorporate them as provinces. This conquest, was particularly brutal. Thousands died, thousands of others were deported, the economy was shattered.

But, despite efforts to suppress the national traditions of these proud people, their spirit and their devotion to the principles of freedom and democracy have endured. The passing years have not weakened their desire for liberty and self-determination.

I am confident that the people of Lithuania will one day regain their freedom, for they are a nation of Christian traditions with the faith to persevere. But we in the free world must give them the encouragement to continue the fight. We must let them know that America still stands devoted, as they do, to the principles of justice and the right of self-determination.

We must not, for a minute, forget the fate of this and other nations who have contributed so much to civilization and whose right to self-government has so brutally been taken from them. All who cherish freedom in the world have a common interest, and likewise we share a common threat. Lithuanian Independence Day, therefore, should be for Americans, a day of prayerful reflection and renewed dedication.

I know the people of my district join me in saluting the courageous people of Lithuania and also in expressing the hope that one day February 16 will again be truly a day of rejoicing for this valiant nation. As long as freedom exists anywhere in the world, and as long as we in the free world continue to give them encouragement, I know that the people of Lithuania will not abandon their dream of liberation.

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, a brave people observed the 51st anniversary of their country's declaration of independence. There was one place, however, where there could be no such commemoration—in the country itself.

In July 1940, Soviet Russia invaded Lithuania, commencing the occupation which has oppressed that nation. For those of us whose memories might have been dimmed over the ensuing years, the invasion of Czechoslovakia last year should serve as a reminder.

There will be no self-immolations to dramatize the plight of Lithuania, Latvia, or Estonia. These people, and the other captive nations, have long since fallen to the depths of quiet despair.

It is for us here to demand that Soviet Russia grant the same right of self-determination to Lithuania that the Russians demand for the peoples of Asia and Africa.

As a nation which demands justice for all, we can do no less.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, this month we celebrate the 51st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Lithuanian Republic. Our observance of this anniversary is much more than the marking of an historic event in the history of nations, it is a recognition of the courageous resolve with which the people of that great Republic have steadfastly maintained their love of freedom in spite of circumstances which negate any possibility of individual freedom existing anywhere but as an ideal in the minds of its people.

Lithuania was declared an independent nation on February 16, 1918, and in the short 22 years that it enjoyed independence it made great progress in the areas of labor, education, and land reform. However, the enjoyment of true liberty was brutally cut off in 1940 when the Soviet Union forcefully annexed that Republic with its Union of Socialist Republics, an incorporation which has never been recognized by the United States. Since that date, Lithuania has remained a hapless victim of the oppressive methods and policies of the Soviet Union.

While we deeply sympathize with the people of Lithuania for being crudely enchained in the harsh yoke of communism, we rejoice that their physical bondage has failed to break their constant hope for sovereignty and with it, once again, individual freedom.

While we cannot physically interfere to restore full enjoyment of liberty to the people of Lithuania, we hope that our sincere concern for their plight may serve as a constant source of encouragement for them to maintain their resolve to throw off the chains of communism, and to give notice to the world that Lithuania, an unwilling captive of the Soviet Union, looks to the day when the Lithuanian Republic will once again be allowed to plot its own destiny.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, on this occasion, the 51st anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, I wish to restate my feelings of sympathy not only for the courageous Lithuanians still under the thumb of Russian aggression, but for our own citizens of Lithuanian ancestry who feel so keenly the separation from their mother country because they can in no way communicate with their relatives and dear ones there.

Lithuanian Americans, as well as Lithuanians everywhere this side of the Iron Curtain, will observe the day with fitting ceremonies; meanwhile, Lithuanians in the homeland completely shut off by the Iron Curtain will silently and secretly join in observing an independence which has been temporarily put aside.

In the brief span between the two world wars, Lithuania established her right to take her place in the family of free nations. The cause of freedom was precious to her and her progress was remarkable. Today Lithuania as a nation is being exterminated.

Lithuania, together with other nations behind the Iron Curtain, is waging a great struggle against world Communist expansion. Their fight for freedom is not only for their own liberation; it is also a fight for freedom in the world.

Freedom-loving Americans everywhere admire the spirit through which this

small country had attained its independence, and it is the hope and prayer of all of us that Lithuania may soon again take its place among the free nations of the world.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marked the 51st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. Today we in the Congress pause in our deliberations in recognition of this significant event in order to pay tribute to the peoples of Lithuania on their proud but sad anniversary. It is fitting that the Congress devote this time to commend the Lithuanian people and to remind the world that Lithuania and its people continue to fight for the reestablishment of complete independence and self-government. We send greetings from all the American people to the captive peoples of Lithuania along with words of assurance that they will never be forgotten.

On February 16, 1918, the Lithuania nation declared its independence. This was a goal for which the Lithuanian people had been striving throughout a long period of Russian domination—1795–1915—followed by German occupation during World War I. For two decades from that day in 1918, the Lithuanian people lived and thrived in that light of freedom which we Americans believe is the birthright of all men.

During the period of independence, great emphasis was placed on improving agriculture, the primary occupation of the Lithuanians. A land reform program was instituted with the result that Lithuania became a nation of small farmers. Industrialization progressed and employment expanded. Lithuania also made progress in social legislation, with a labor control law, the introduction of the 8-hour day, and various other social measures. In addition, Lithuanian literature flourished and achievements were made in opera and music. However, when the shadows of World War II fell over Europe, Lithuania, along with so many other small nations, was an early casualty. Lithuania fell under Russian domination and at the end of the war the Soviet armies remained and the country was incorporated into the Soviet Union. The United States has never recognized that incorporation and the American people have long exhibited their concern and sympathy for Lithuania—a country who knew freedom only to lose it to Communist enslavement.

Mr. Speaker, in response to the kind invitation of Mrs. Elizabeth V. Paurazas, president of the Detroit Lithuanian Organizations Center, I had the honor of addressing their Lithuanian Independence Day rally at Mercy College in Detroit last Sunday, February 16. The fact that Americans of all origins continue to hold and attend these celebrations proves that the plight of Lithuania and her people has not been forgotten. When Americans, or freedom-loving people anywhere, begin to forget these anniversaries or to simply ignore them that will be a sad day for millions of our fellow human beings who have had their liberty taken away from them. Let us continue to remember until freedom and independence become a reality to all.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for seven centuries the people of the Baltic countries have had to maintain a constant struggle against the oppression of their larger eastern neighbor, Russia. Since their birth as free and independent nation-states in the 13th century, they have been the victims of the empirical Russian desire to obtain a "Window on the Baltic Sea."

In the end, even as civilization was awakening to the values and virtues of freedom, in the late 18th century, they were ensnared by the Russian Bear. From that day on, the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have maintained unceasing efforts to secure their independence and retain the national identities.

Five times, in the century and a half that followed, they rose in revolt against their oppressors, each time to be savagely subdued. Finally, in 1917, they again secured their sovereignty, and became active members of the world community, until once more enslaved by the Soviets, a mere 20 years later.

The Communists have realized that national pride and the longing for liberty are too strong to beat down with a club, and so have undertaken a campaign to destroy the culture, language, and even the population of the Baltic states. They have outlawed their native dialect, attempting to replace it with Russian; they have outlawed all works of art and printing which refer in any way to the three states as distinct entities; and, most disgusting of all, they have even attempted to eliminate them as people altogether, by mass deportations and colonization of their lands.

But still the struggle for self-determination goes on. And so, on this, the 51st anniversary of Lithuanian independence, I pledge my support to the pursuit of freedom, and my hopes that some day soon, the liberty loving people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia will once again be able to govern themselves in peace and freedom.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, all wars cause desolation and destruction, untold misery and endless suffering to millions of peoples, and they have been the source of many complex international problems which plague us today. Certain wars, however destructive and deadly, do bring at least some good results in their train, by giving freedom to subdued and submerged nations that have long sought and hoped for their independence. The First World War did produce such a happy result. It differed from the last world war in that many nationality groups which had lost their national political liberties for centuries, freed themselves from their oppressors and proclaimed their independence. Lithuania, whose independence day is being celebrated now, was one of the countries that attained its independence in the First World War.

The Lithuanian people are justly proud of their long and glorious history. For centuries the Lithuanian kingdom was a powerful force in Eastern Europe. The Lithuanians not only succeeded in repelling at least some of the incursions of barbarian invaders coming from the East into northeastern Europe, but they also

were the champions and the advance guard of Christianity in that part of Europe. Late in the 16th century the Lithuanians united with the Poles, and formed a dual monarchy. The union lasted for about 200 years. During that time the destiny of Lithuania was wedded to that of Poland, and in the late 18th century when Poland was partitioned, a large part of Poland, and with it all of Lithuania, was incorporated into the Russian Empire.

The loss of national independence by Lithuania did not mean the loss of the Lithuanian spirit of independence. Throughout their trying years under czarist domination the Lithuanians learned that individual or group well-being could not be fully achieved without national political independence. They learned that in order to enjoy the benefits of their labor, they should have complete freedom in their homeland. Consequently, for more than 100 years, until the day whose 51st anniversary we are now observing, they worked ceaselessly for the realization of their most cherished ideal, for the independence of Lithuania. None of the repressive measures of the Russian regime, none of its harshness, nor its proscription of the Lithuanian language and culture, none of these could dissuade the patriotic and freedom-loving Lithuanians from their firm conviction that no amount of material and even human sacrifice was too much for the realization of their national goal. They fought for it openly as well as secretly. They staged open rebellions against their oppressors more than once, but they had to wait until World War I for the actual achievement of their national independence.

When Lithuania proclaimed its independence, the war was still raging, and most of the country was still under enemy occupation. Soon, however, the war ended and all Lithuanians joined hands, not only in the fullness of joy to celebrate their victory, but also for the rebuilding of their now liberated country. In this difficult task they were remarkably successful. In a few years normalcy was restored, and Lithuania was blessed with prosperity and progress. For more than two decades the Lithuanians lived in the happiness of freedom. Then came the rude shock from the sudden unleashing of evil international forces. Hemmed in between the vast military machines of Nazi Germany and Communist Russia, little Lithuania could not hope to cope with either. In mid-1940 Lithuania was invaded and occupied by the Red army, and then the country was against the will of the people, forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union.

Since then Lithuanians have not known freedom in their homeland, and today they still suffer under Communist totalitarian tyranny. Of course in Lithuania they are not free to observe their Independence Day, their national holiday. But we in the free world observe the anniversary of that memorable event and hope that these stouthearted people will again quickly regain their freedom and live in peace in their homeland.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, Lithuanians in the United States and throughout the world ob-

served the 51st anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania.

Ironically, the only country in which this occasion will not be commemorated is Lithuania, itself. Though Lithuanians did proclaim their independence after generations of struggle against foreign domination, though they did make unprecedented strides in securing liberty for all Lithuanian citizens, yet today these courageous people live under Communist tyranny.

This anniversary is a reminder to us all that only a minority of the world's population enjoys the basic freedoms which we often take for granted. Furthermore, it should remind us of the millions who long for independence, especially those who once had their dreams of freedom fulfilled, only to have them shattered again two decades later.

Man has a basic right to choose the type of government under which he wishes to live. Fifty-one years ago the proud and valiant people of Lithuania made that choice; they chose democracy. And today, though illegally dominated by Soviet rule, the Lithuanian people still choose democracy. Even though communism has overrun their country, it can never overrun their minds and hearts. We salute the courage of the Lithuanian people for their undaunting spirit and share with them the hope that their dream of liberty will again be realized for all time.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would also like to include in the RECORD the following statement by the Lithuanian American Council, Inc.:

PRO MEMORIA: ON LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Soviet Russia's invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1968 was a dramatic reminder to the free world of the identical Soviet invasion and occupation of Lithuania and the other two Baltic States in 1940. In both instances the Soviet aggression was unprovoked, in flagrant violation of existing treaties and international law, and against the free will of the people.

The United States Government sternly denounced this wanton Soviet aggression in July 1940 and has steadfastly refused to recognize the illegal annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet communists. This just and honorable position, a basic tenet of United States policy, has been maintained by all succeeding administrations.

Despite the condemnations of the occupation by the free world, the Soviet Union still forces Lithuania and its people to suffer oppression and exploitation under despotic communist rule. Lithuanian national culture is gradually being destroyed and russification of the country and its people is being brought about. Yet, even though their country has been converted into a colony of the Soviet empire, the people of Lithuania—and the patriotic Americans of Lithuanian descent—demand

FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE FOR LITHUANIA!

We are sincerely grateful to the United States Government for its continued firm refusal to recognize the consequence of Soviet aggression. However, this stand in itself is not sufficient to bring about the liberation of presently-subjugated nations.

It is our firm conviction that strong and steady pressure must be exerted upon the rulers of Soviet Union by the governments and people of the free world to effect the liberation of Soviet-captive nations. We demand, and ask the free world to join us in demanding, that the Soviets withdraw their army, police and ruling apparatus from

Lithuania, so the people of Lithuania could freely elect a government of their own choosing, in accord with the Atlantic and United Nations Charters and the principle of self-determination which the Soviets demand for the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin American countries.

As citizens of the United States, we Americans of Lithuanian descent appeal to you to urge the United States Government to take all possible peaceable means to restore the freedom and independence of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and all other captive nations.

LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, my many Lithuanian friends in the Greater Cleveland area, are well acquainted with the grave concern I feel for their homeland. Year after year, we in the House and Senate rise to pay tribute to the valiant spirit of those Lithuanians behind the Iron Curtain, and the undying desire which lives in all our hearts for a restoration of the independence they marked 51 years ago.

As always on these occasions, I point to positive, peaceful actions which we could take to help make liberty a reality to Lithuania and to all the captive nations under Communist domination. Once again I urge that action be taken on my bill to create a House Committee on the Captive Nations and on my resolution to insist that the Soviet Union be required to abide by its charter commitments regarding the sovereignty of nations and the return of political prisoners to their homelands. These measures are House Resolution 77 and House Concurrent Resolution 59.

I also wish to include with my remarks a memorandum sent to me by the Lithuanian Christian Democratic Union Central Committee of Cleveland, Ohio, and a pro memoria on Lithuania's independence, which I received from the Lithuanian American Council, Inc.

The material follows:

LITHUANIAN CHRISTIAN DEMOCRATIC
UNION CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
Cleveland, Ohio.

**MEMORANDUM TO THE HONORABLE MEMBERS OF
THE UNITED STATES SENATE AND THE HOUSE
OF REPRESENTATIVES**

Today marks the Fifty-First Anniversary of the restoration of the independence of Lithuania, once an ancient civilization, whose roots reach to the second century and its kingdom to the thirteenth; that of a nation whose political, economic and social record was as distinctive as it was progressive. It is tragic therefore, that this anniversary is overshadowed by the brutal fact that Lithuania today bears the heavy yoke of Soviet imperialism.

Acting in conspiracy with the Nazi regime (see "Nazi-Soviet Relations 1939-1941", excerpts attached) the Soviet Union broke four major bilateral treaties:

1. The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk of March 3, 1918 in which the Soviet Union forever renounced all claims to Lithuania.
2. The Peace Treaty of July 12, 1920, which defined the common boundaries.
3. The Non-Aggression Pact of September 28, 1926, which was later extended to 1945.
4. The Soviet imposed Mutual Assistance Pact of October 10, 1939.

On June 15, 1940, with the above treaties in full force and effect, the military forces of Soviet Union occupied the territory of Lithuania, and two days later repeated the same attack against the Republics of Latvia and Estonia. Occupation was followed by systematic terror and violence. Religious and political persecutions culminated in mass

executions and deportations to the Siberian wastelands. Many sources place the number of such Baltic victims at the one million mark.

Several weeks later, the Soviets staged mock elections and as the result of these, forcibly incorporated Lithuania and the other Baltic Republics into their slave empire.

On July 23, 1940, the United States denounced this aggression, and all Administrations since then have affirmed this stand and have opposed this brutal invasion and forced annexation.

It is difficult to conceive that during the present rise of many former colonies to their rightly deserved national independences, a shroud of silence is maintained about Lithuania and the other Soviet occupied countries whose traditions of statehood reach back for many centuries.

It is even more difficult to conceive that all the international crimes committed by the Soviet Union are still not rectified, nor the criminal punished. It is indeed a crime in itself that Kremlin is still permitted to indulge in international rape, as in the case of Czechoslovakia just a few short months ago.

It is time to raise such questions before international forums and to seek condemnation of the Soviet Union for its genocidal actions. It is also time to investigate the illegal seizure of Lithuania and the other countries of Eastern Europe and to thoroughly study the prevailing conditions in these countries, the results of which should be made public.

At this time there is a plan submitted by the Honorable Frank Annunzio, U.S. Representative from Illinois, in a form of H. Con. Res. 81, which "Expresses the sense of Congress with respect to the incorporation of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

We ask all of you to support this Resolution. It is one definite way in which you can help us in our fight for liberty and justice.

Very respectfully submitted.

A. J. KASULAITIS,

President, Central Committee.

K. ALGIMANTAS PAUTIENIS,

Chairman, Commission on International

Relations.

NAZI-SOVIET RELATIONS, 1939-41

(Documents from the Archives of the German Foreign Office, edited by Raymond James Sontag and James Stuart Beddie)

[Frames 182-183, serial F 19]

SECRET ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL

On the occasion of the signature of the Nonaggression Pact between the German Reich and the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics the undersigned plenipotentiaries of each of the two parties discussed in strictly confidential conversations the question of the boundary of their respective spheres of influence in Eastern Europe. These conversations led to the following conclusions:

1. In the event of a territorial and political rearrangement in the areas belonging to the Baltic States (Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania), the northern boundary of Lithuania shall represent the boundary of the spheres of influence of Germany and the U.S.S.R. In this connection the interest of Lithuania in the Vilna area is recognized by each party.

2. In the event of a territorial and political rearrangement of the areas belonging to the Polish state the spheres of influence of Germany and the U.S.S.R. shall be bounded approximately by the line of the rivers Narew, Vistula, and San.

The question of whether the interests of both parties make desirable the maintenance of an independent Polish state and how such a state should be bounded can only be definitely determined in the course of further political developments.

In any event both Governments will re-

solve this question by means of a friendly agreement.

3. With regard to Southeastern Europe attention is called by the Soviet side to its interest in Bessarabia. The German side declares its complete political disinterestedness in these areas.²⁴

4. This protocol shall be treated by both parties as strictly secret.

Moscow, August 23, 1939.

For the Government of the German Reich:
V. RIBBENTROP.

Plenipotentiary of the Government of the U.S.S.R.:

V. MOLOTOV.

[Frames 0326-0325, serial F 2]

SECRET SUPPLEMENTARY PROTOCOL

The undersigned Plenipotentiaries declare the agreement of the Government of the German Reich and the Government of the U.S.S.R. upon the following:

The Secret Supplementary Protocol signed on August 23, 1939, shall be amended in item 1 to the effect that the territory of the Lithuanian state falls to the sphere of influence of the U.S.S.R., while, on the other hand, the province of Lublin and parts of the province of Warsaw fall to the sphere of influence of Germany (cf. the map attached to the Boundary and Friendship Treaty signed today). As soon as the Government of the U.S.S.R. shall take special measures on Lithuanian territory to protect its interests, the present German-Lithuanian border, for the purpose of a natural and simple boundary delineation, shall be rectified in such a way that the Lithuanian territory situated to the southwest of the line marked on the attached map should fall to Germany.

Further it is declared that the economic agreements now in force between Germany and Lithuania shall not be affected by the measures of the Soviet Union referred to above.

Moscow, September 28, 1939.

For the Government of the German Reich:

J. RIBBENTROP.

By authority of the Government of the U.S.S.R.:

W. MOLOTOV.

[Frame 0329, serial F 2]

SECRET SUPPLEMENTARY PROTOCOL

The undersigned plenipotentiaries, on concluding the German-Russian Boundary and Friendship Treaty, have declared their agreement upon the following:

Both parties will tolerate in their territories no Polish agitation which affects the territories of the other party. They will suppress in their territories all beginnings of such agitation and inform each other concerning suitable measures for this purpose.

Moscow, September 28, 1939.

For the Government of the German Reich:

J. RIBBENTROP.

By authority of the Government of the U.S.S.R.:

W. MOLOTOV.

The Minister then stated that particularly in view of the known attitude of Germany he had omitted one point in the note, which the other Lithuanian Ministers would include in their notes to the governments to which they were accredited, namely, the re-

quest that the incorporation not be recognized. The Minister asked whether he could not at least orally present this request here. I rejected this, whereupon the Minister stated that the request was to be considered as not having been made. Finally, the Minister said that he intended to make known his action by an announcement from the Berlin office of the Elite Agency, since this appeared to him necessary for the assertion of his personal attitude toward events.

I requested the Minister to refrain from this, and he promised to comply.

Transmitted to the Reich Foreign Minister through the State Secretary with the request for instructions whether the note should be retained here. The Latvian and Estonian Ministers may be expected to present similar notes here. The Latvian Minister had already made an appointment with me for 5:30 p.m. today.

WOERMANN.

[Enclosure]

THE LITHUANIAN MINISTER IN GERMANY
(SKIRPA) TO THE REICH FOREIGN MINISTER
3991
BERLIN, July 21, 1940.

HERR REICH MINISTER: I have the honor, Excellency, to bring the following to your attention:

As is already known, on June 14, 1940, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics presented an ultimatum to Lithuania under flimsy and unjustified pretexts, in which it was demanded:

1. that the constitutional government of Lithuania be forced to resign immediately;
2. that the Minister of the Interior and the Chief of the State Security Police be tried without preferring charges based on law, and
3. that free and unlimited entry of Soviet military forces into Lithuania be granted.

On the following day the Russian Red Army, after having attacked the Lithuanian frontier guards, crossed the Lithuanian border and occupied all of Lithuania. Furthermore, a puppet government was forced upon us by a high Soviet official sent from Moscow for this purpose, and the entire administration was put under the control of the Government of the Soviet Socialist Republics.

In order to incorporate Lithuania fully into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, elections to the Seim (Parliament) were ordered on July 14, resulting in the greatest falsification of the will of the Lithuanian population.

In order to quell any expression of resistance, even before the elections all Lithuanian clubs and organizations were suppressed, the Lithuanian press was seized and its editors removed by force, and the more or less influential personalities in public life were arrested. People who previously were considered open enemies of the Lithuanian State were appointed to Government offices, particularly in the State Security Police.

The Communist Party was the only political organization which was allowed to function legally. And it then exerted the decisive influence on the scheduled elections. Only one list of candidates was permitted, namely, the one that was agreeable to the Communist Party.

In order to force the necessary participation in the elections anybody who did not wish to vote was threatened with being declared an enemy of the people, and personal attendance was strictly checked.

It was immediately obvious that the Seim, elected under such circumstances, was only a blind tool in the hands of the Communist Party and thereby of the Government of the Soviet Socialist Republics. Today, on July 21, 1940, the Seim adopted a resolution to establish the Soviet system within the country and to incorporate Lithuania into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of Russia.

All these measures of the Government of

the U.S.S.R. amount to a flagrant violation of all treaties signed between the Republic of Lithuania and the U.S.S.R., in particular however:

1. of the Peace Treaty of July 12, 1920, by which the U.S.S.R. as successor of the former Russian Tsarist Empire recognized unconditionally the independence and autonomy of Lithuania, and by which she renounced forever all rights of sovereignty which Russia previously had over Lithuania (see article 1);

2. of the Nonaggression Pact of September 22, 1926, and of its renewals of May 6, 1931, and of April 4, 1934. In this Pact the U.S.S.R. obligates herself to respect the sovereignty of Lithuania as well as her territorial integrity and inviolability under all circumstances (see article 2) and to refrain from any use of force (article 3);

3. Of the Mutual Assistance Pact of October 10, 1939, in which the Government of the U.S.S.R. repeats a solemn assurance to Lithuania not to violate in any way the sovereignty of the Lithuanian State, as well as its internal order.

In view of all these circumstances I feel compelled as the Minister appointed by the constitutional agencies of the Republic of Lithuania and accredited to the German Reich to lodge the most solemn and determined protest against the oppression of my country and the deprivation of sovereignty and national independence of Lithuania by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and to declare that because the above-mentioned resolution of the Seim was imposed by Russian occupation authorities it amounts to nothing but the most outrageous falsification of the expression of the will of the Lithuanian people and that it is in the sharpest conflict with the constitution and interests of the Lithuanian State, as well as the free right of self-determination of nations, and that, therefore, it cannot be recognized as valid in any way.

I avail myself of the opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurance of my highest consideration.

K. SKIRPA.

[Frames 214780-214781, serial 104]

FOREIGN OFFICE MEMORANDUM

BERLIN, July 22, 1940.

The Latvian Minister called on me today and gave me the enclosed letter to the Reich Foreign Minister, in which he as Minister of the "legitimate Government of Latvia" protests against the incorporation of Latvia into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In this connection the Minister remarked that he would not think of creating any difficulties for Germany. None could, in his opinion, result from his entering this protest here.

I told Herr Kreewinsch that I would keep his letter personally for the time being. I would notify him later whether the letter could remain here or not.

In connection with the memorandum of the conversation with the Lithuanian Minister²⁵ there is transmitted herewith this report to the Reich Foreign Minister through the State Secretary, with the request for action.

WOERMANN.

[Frame 112966, serial 104]

THE REICH FOREIGN MINISTER TO THE GERMAN AMBASSADOR IN THE SOVIET UNION
(SCHULENBURG)

Telegram

No. 57. Teletype from Fuschel No. 12 of January 10, 11:45 p.m.

Reference your telegram No. 50 of January 8.²⁶

I request you not to broach the question of increased German troop shipments to Rumania with the Soviet Government.

²⁵ Ante, p. 168.

²⁶ Not printed.

²⁴ The German text of this article of the Protocol is as follows: "Hinsichtlich des Südostens Europas wird von sowjetischer Seite das Interesse an Bessarabien betont. Von deutscher Seite wird das völlige politische Desinteressement an diesen Gebieten erklärt."

For a statement by the Reich Foreign Minister concerning the discussion of these subjects at the time of the conclusion of the Nonaggression Pact, see Ribbentrop's memorandum for Hitler of June 24, 1940, *post*, p. 157.

Should you be approached regarding the matter by Herr Molotov or some other influential person in the Soviet Government, please say that according to your information the sending of German troops was exclusively a matter of precautionary military measures against England. The English already had military contingents on Greek soil and it was to be expected that they would further increase those contingents in the immediate future. Germany would not under any circumstances tolerate England's gaining a foothold on Greek soil. Please do not go into greater detail until further notice.

RIBBENTROP

[Frames 833-834, serial F 15]

SECRET PROTOCOL

The German Ambassador, Count von der Schulenburg, Plenipotentiary of the Government of the German Reich, on the one hand, and the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R., V. M. Molotov, Plenipotentiary of the Government of the U.S.S.R., on the other hand, have agreed upon the following:

1. The Government of the German Reich renounces its claim to the strip of Lithuanian territory which is mentioned in the Secret Supplementary Protocol of September 28, 1939¹⁰ and which has been marked on the map attached to this Protocol;

2. The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is prepared to compensate the Government of the German Reich for the territory mentioned in Point 1 of this Protocol by paying 7,500,000 gold dollars or 31,500,000 Reichsmarks to Germany.

The amount of 31.5 million Reichsmarks will be paid by the Government of the U.S.S.R. in the following manner: one-eighth, that is, 3,937,500 Reichsmarks, in non-ferrous metal deliveries within three months after the signing of this Protocol, the remaining seven-eighths, or 27,562,500 Reichsmarks, in gold by deduction from the German gold payments which Germany is to make by February 11, 1941 in accordance with the correspondence exchanged between the Chairman of the German Economic Delegation, Dr. Schnurre, and the People's Commissar for Foreign Trade of the U.S.S.R., Herr A. I. Mikoyan, in connection with the "Agreement of January 10, 1941 concerning reciprocal deliveries in the second treaty period on the basis of the Economic Agreement between the German Reich and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of February 11, 1940."

3. This Protocol has been executed in two originals in the German language and two originals in the Russian language and shall become effective immediately upon signature.

Moscow, January 10, 1941.

For the Government of the German Reich:
SCHULENBURG.

By authority of the Government of the U.S.S.R.:

V. MOLOTOV.

[Frames 112984-112986, serial 104]

THE STATE SECRETARY IN THE GERMAN FOREIGN OFFICE (WEIZSÄCKER) TO THE REICH FOREIGN MINISTER

BERLIN, January 17, 1941.

Secret.

St. S. Nr. 52.

By wire by fastest means to the Reich Foreign Minister (teletype or telephone).

The Russian Ambassador called on me this afternoon. On the basis of a memorandum which he handed me later on, he stated the following:

"According to all reports, German troops in great numbers are in Rumania and are now prepared to march into Bulgaria, having as their goal the occupation of Bulgaria, Greece, and the Straits. There can be no

doubt that England will try to forestall the operations of German troops, to occupy the Straits, to start military operations against Bulgaria in alliance with Turkey, and turn Bulgaria into a theater of operations. The Soviet Government has stated repeatedly to the German Government that it considers the territory of Bulgaria and of the Straits as the security zone of the U.S.S.R. and that it cannot be indifferent to events which threaten the security interests of the U.S.S.R. In view of all this the Soviet Government regards * * *.

PRO MEMORIA ON LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Soviet Russia's invasion and occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1938 was a dramatic reminder to the free world of the identical Soviet invasion and occupation of Lithuania and the other two Baltic States in 1940. In both instances the Soviet aggression was unprovoked, in flagrant violation of existing treaties and international law, and against the free will of the people.

The United States Government sternly denounced this wanton Soviet aggression in 1940 and has steadfastly refused to recognize the illegal annexation of Lithuania by the Soviet communists. This just and honorable position, a basic tenet of United States policy, has been maintained by all succeeding administrations.

Despite the condemnation of the occupation by the free world, the Soviet Union still forces Lithuania and its people to suffer oppression and exploitation under despotic communist rule. Lithuanian national culture is gradually being destroyed and russification of the country and its people is being brought about. Yet, even though their country has been converted into a colony of the Soviet empire, the people of Lithuania—and the patriotic Americans of Lithuanian descent—demand freedom and independence for Lithuania!

We are sincerely grateful to the United States Government for its continued firm refusal to recognize the consequence of Soviet aggression. However, this stand in itself is not sufficient to bring about the liberation of presently-subjugated nations.

It is our firm conviction that strong and steady pressure must be exerted upon the rulers of Soviet Union by the governments and peoples of the free world to effect the liberation of Soviet-captive nations. We demand, and ask the free world to join us in demanding, that the Soviets withdraw their army, police and ruling apparatus from Lithuania, so the people of Lithuania could freely elect a government of their own choosing, in accord with the Atlantic and United Nations Charters and the principle of self-determination which the Soviets demand for the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin American countries.

As citizens of the United States, we Americans of Lithuanian descent appeal to you to urge the United States Government to take all possible peaceable means to restore the freedom and independence of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and all other captive nations. LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor and a privilege to join with my esteemed colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable DAN FLOOD, in commemorating the 51st anniversary of the declaration of Lithuanian independence.

The example of the Lithuanian exiles here in this country is a constant demonstration that their memory of the freedom the land of their forefathers once enjoyed has not grown dim. In turn, all Americans must not let the years have a dimming effect on our own memory of Lithuania's independence.

Our commemoration of this people's history of independence is meant not only to stir the fires of freedom in the hearts of Lithuanians, but also to fuel the fires of patriotism in our own hearts.

The Lithuanian American Council, and its counterparts throughout the free world, are to be commended for their determined efforts to restore the freedom which Lithuania knew until 1940. As you know, Mr. Speaker, it was on June 15, 1940, that the armies of Soviet Russia invaded and subjugated the Lithuanian people. Since then one must marvel at the patience, courage, and dedication of the Lithuanian people.

History is actually a story of such human desires and values. Although inventions and material progress seemingly have the greatest impact upon mankind's institutions, it is ultimately the human spirit which marks the destiny of man.

Men, not the machines they create, will decide who shall triumph in the struggle between freedom and totalitarianism. Despite the harrowing power and explosiveness of modern weapons, the human spirit remains the ultimate weapon in any conflict.

This is why it is not only fitting, but indeed necessary, that we pause today in our legislative deliberations to praise the indomitable spirit of the people of Lithuania—a people whose history is filled with courageous deeds in defense of their liberty. These deeds give shining testimony to their devotion to freedom and independence.

For almost three decades now the people of Lithuania have steadfastly and bravely resisted every effort of the Soviet dictators to convert them to the Communist outlook and way of life.

The Lithuanian people continue to hope for, and patiently await the day when liberty and national independence will be restored to them. Their determination and dedication is of the same intensity which has often before changed the course of history.

Today, on this 51st anniversary of their declaration of independence, let us join our hopes and prayers with the Lithuanian people.

We, the people of America, share with them their love for freedom. We, with them, hope for a better, brighter tomorrow when Lithuania once again is free of the yoke of Communist tyranny and can take its rightful place in the world community of nations.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is a particular pleasure and privilege to join with my colleagues here in commemorating the 51st anniversary of the independence of the gallant Lithuanian nation.

Fifty-one years ago, Lithuania stood forth as an independent, democratic republic with a happy, prosperous people who faced the future with confidence in their destiny. In this year of 1969, our observance is unfortunately shaded with sorrow. The bright star of Lithuania's freedom has been clouded over by the violent storms of tyranny. We gaze with sadness upon the advancing tragedy of sacrifice to ruthless imperialism that has enveloped Lithuania; she has ceased to be an independent nation.

¹⁰ Ante, p. 107.

The world does not know all of the terrible details of what has happened to Lithuanians behind the Iron Curtain, but we do know that hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians have been liquidated, martyred for their patriotism, their religious faith, and their steadfast resistance to tyranny. They have been torn from their families and homes for service as slaves in Siberia. We grieve deeply for the terrible catastrophe that has befallen this tiny country.

Under ordinary circumstances, this anniversary commemoration ought to be a day of rejoicing for all Lithuanians, but how can they rejoice when their people are suffering under the oppression of Communist tyrants? We cannot be happy on this occasion, but we can hope and we can pray.

Lithuanians have had times of trial frequently in their history. In days gone by, many foreign tyrants have dominated the freedom-loving Lithuanians. Although these tyrants may have been temporarily able to destroy their liberties, they were never quite able to destroy the dreams of independence in the minds of the Lithuanian people, nor could they destroy the aspirations for freedom everlasting in their hearts.

The last two decades of Lithuanian history are recorded in infamy. The deportations, the enslavements, the destruction of political freedom and economic initiative are facts which have trickled through to the free world despite the curtain of silence behind which the Communists try to hide the countries they have overrun.

We know that the Lithuanians are of stout heart. We know that faith and hope cannot be muffled in the Lithuanian hearts. Inevitably the time will come when the tyrant's grip will weaken, when freedom will win over enslavement, and sorrow will be turned to joy.

The American people and Government have refused to recognize the Soviet Union's annexation of Lithuania. In many ways, America is informing the world of Soviet misdeeds in Lithuania, and is mobilizing the moral force of world opinion against the oppressors in the hope that Lithuania's day of freedom will be hastened and that the Kremlin's rule of misery and hatred will be forever overturned. With the utmost sincerity, I express to all Lithuanians and Lithuanian-Americans my hope and prayer that that happy day will be soon.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to pay well-deserved tribute to Lithuania on the 51st anniversary of its independence.

On February 16, 1918, following more than 100 years of Russian domination and 3 years of occupation by Germany, the nation of Lithuania declared its independence. Despite the great cost of World War I in lives and in the destruction of property, Lithuania was able, during the 1920's and 1930's, to build a viable state and to foster the growth of agriculture and industry. Land reform provides an excellent example of the progress achieved in agriculture. Before World War I approximately 450 families owned more than 20 percent of all the land with a minimum ownership estimated at 2,000 acres. By 1939 there were

335,720 farming units, raising a variety of grains, potatoes, sugar beets, livestock, and poultry. Phenomenal growth also occurred in industry. In 1913 Lithuania had only 151 industrial establishments employing 6,603 workers, while in 1939 there were 16,131 enterprises with 33,000 employees.

Tragically for these hard-working and freedom-loving people, their independence came to an abrupt end with the outbreak of World War II. Occupied by the Red army, Lithuania was declared a component Republic of the U.S.S.R. on August 3, 1940. After a period of control by the Nazis, the Soviet Union reconquered Lithuania in 1944.

Since the end of World War II, the Communists have worked diligently to stamp out all vestiges of the Lithuanians' spirit of freedom and cultural identity. They have not succeeded and we know they never will. Here in the United States our belief in the ultimate triumph of Lithuania is reinforced daily. We have only to observe our own countrymen of Lithuanian descent to know that a strong commitment to freedom and independence lives on, despite Russian tyranny, in the hearts of all Lithuanians.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 51st anniversary of the independence of the Lithuanian people. It is with a deep sense of regret that I cannot refer to an independent Lithuania today. Lithuanian independence lasted for only a little over 20 years. However, this rather short period of freedom was characterized by significant reforms in both social and economic areas. This progress was, to the profound regret of all, stifled by the Soviet occupation in 1940 and then by the subsequent German presence. With the elimination of the Nazi scourge, Soviet forces again engulfed Lithuania and have occupied it ever since.

By its military presence and use of terror the Soviet Union has suppressed the freedom-loving people of Lithuania along with Estonia and Latvia. But the idea of freedom cannot be erased from the minds of the people. The mind of man can never be conquered. Independence is and will always continue to be the goal of the great Lithuanian people. I fervently hope that one day Lithuanian freedom and independence will be a fact rather than the mere hope it is today.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, February 16 marks one of the most important days in the history of man's pursuit of freedom. On that day, 51 years ago, the Republic of Lithuania was established. That occasion was a reaffirmation of the Lithuanian peoples' devotion to the principles of liberty and self-determination. For throughout her history, from the 14th century on, Lithuania has sought her place in the world community as a sovereign nation.

Regrettably, the nation-state proclaimed on February 16, 1918, was short-lived. But during her 22 years, the Republic of Lithuania made great strides in reestablishing her national identity, her culture, her society. It was her unfortunate fate as it was the fate of other Eastern European nations to fall victim to 20th century imperialism.

Though we lament this sad course of

events, our hopes for world peace are uplifted by the spirit and legacy the Lithuanian people have bequeathed to the cause of freedom and liberty. Indeed, it would be well for us to pause and to reflect for a moment on the contributions the people of Lithuania have made to the quest for human rights.

We are deeply indebted to these great patriots for their dedicated service to the cause of freedom.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues and the Lithuanian people in celebrating the 51st anniversary of the signing of the Lithuanian declaration of independence. As in our celebration of the American Declaration of Independence, we pay tribute to the cultural and intellectual achievements made possible by the self-government of an inspired people.

When the delegates gathered at Vilnius in 1918 to proclaim the Republic of Lithuania, they initiated 20 years of brilliant cultural, intellectual, and political achievement under a strong republic, and maintained their independence in the face of far more powerful neighbors until the world catastrophe of 1939.

In the 1922 constitution of the republic, the Lithuanian people provided themselves with the fundamental, inalienable rights, and liberties of man—the freedom to speak without oppression, to assemble without fear, and to practice their religion unharassed. This democratic government made the war-ravaged country economically and politically sound, respected by governments of the world, as an independent republic in the family of nations. The Lithuanian people revived their national institutions, and produced such authors as Maironis, Jakspas, Sruoga, Binkis, and others.

The thousands of freedom-loving people of Lithuania who came to the United States—many of whom settled in the greater Cleveland area—have made great intellectual and cultural contributions in the United States, proving once more that man's greatest achievements are inspired by a free people working in a free and democratic society.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact that Lithuania is not a free and independent nation and is held captive by the U.S.S.R., we here in the Congress do take note that February 16, 1969, marks the 51st anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence.

We do so in order to again reaffirm the official United States stand of nonrecognition of Lithuania's forcible incorporation into the Soviet Union and, thus, help to keep up the spirit and hope for ultimate freedom and independence of Lithuania and all captive nations, in the hearts of the people everywhere.

The teeming millions of oppressed peoples behind the Iron Curtain and under Red Communist domination look to the United States as a citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their eventual liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment and benefits of their respective religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties.

Despite the condemnation by the free world of the forced occupation of Lith-

uania by the U.S.S.R., the Soviet Union still compels Lithuania and other captive nations to suffer oppression and tyranny. To these unfortunate nations and their people we convey our heartfelt sympathy and understanding and appreciation of the reality of the Iron Curtain as a barrier. It signifies a failure on the part of the Soviet system to reach its goals and to provide successful competition with the free world for the minds and loyalties of the captives behind that barrier.

Knowing the sterling qualities of the many Lithuanians who have come to these shores of our country and become citizens of the United States of whom we are very proud, I feel confident that their fellow countrymen will continue in their firm opposition to the Communists. I also wish to assure them of America's commitment to the cause of liberty and international morality. There is no doubt that justice will prevail in the end and that Lithuania will take its place as a truly free and independent nation in the not too distant future.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FLOOD, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 days to extend their remarks on the subject of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EPIDEMIC PREVENTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. CAHILL) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CAHILL, Mr. Speaker, as the effects of the recent nationwide Hong Kong flu epidemic subside, I believe it is time for a hard appraisal as to what can or should be done in its aftermath. We must take whatever steps are feasible in order to protect our Nation from a recurrence of such crippling epidemics.

Criticisms were made of the drug companies, that they did not work as fast as they could have in producing the necessary flu vaccine. There are indications, however, that the criticisms notwithstanding, many of the larger drug companies did work diligently. It seems that the problem here was that this was a new virus variant which was not identified until midsummer.

Although the U.S. Health Service has a fairly adequate early warning system for the detection of epidemic-type diseases, it is fettered by a reluctance of the Public Health Service to impose financial risk upon the drug companies.

The way the detection system works is as follows: The Communicable Disease Center in Atlanta, Ga., which is part of the World Health network sponsored by the United Nations, gathers information as to new or potential virus strains throughout the world. That Center then supplies this information to the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices and to the Division on Biological Standards of the Public Health Service. These

two committees then jointly make recommendations to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as to what vaccines, type, and quality, will be necessary to meet any potential epidemics and also the number of doses that will be necessary.

Thus, while there is a fairly good early warning system for detection of epidemics there is a regrettable and harmful reluctance on the part of both the Public Health Service and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to call upon drug companies to produce. They are fearful that a drug company after having geared itself for mass production, will suffer great economic loss if the epidemic does not actually occur.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which will do two things. It will provide wider latitude of discretion in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to find and declare epidemics and, secondly, it will guarantee reimbursement of drug companies for any losses which might be sustained.

Under my bill if the Secretary determines that an epidemic may reasonably occur in the United States he shall publish in the Federal Register an epidemic notice which shall contain such determination and shall identify the vaccine that he determines should be used to immunize persons against infection from this specific virus. A "registered" drug company can make application to the Secretary for a production cost guarantee which will, first, specify the amount of vaccine with respect to which the guarantee applies, but not exceeding 20 million doses, and which, second, will obligate the United States for a 6-month period to reimburse the registered drug company for 40 percent of the production cost.

This morning's Washington Post, in an article by Victor Cohn, carries a foreboding article predicting the likelihood of a major epidemic of German measles in the United States in 1970. This, in my judgment, underscores the gravity of the situation which confronts us under present procedures. I believe we must act now to encourage, first, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to declare the possibility of an epidemic, no matter how remote, and, second, to encourage the drug companies to prepare for production of necessary vaccines without threat of irreparable financial loss.

I am introducing the article by Mr. Cohn into the RECORD along with my remarks:

GERMAN MEASLES VACCINE LIKELY BY FALL— GREATER PERIL REVEALED

(By Victor Cohn)

A German measles vaccine is likely to be available before next fall. One could be licensed as early as April.

There is still doubt whether enough vaccine can be produced in time to prevent a possible 1970 German measles epidemic. Opinions differ on whether an epidemic is likely.

The disease, however, may be a far graver threat than anyone has realized.

All these assessments were made at Bethesda yesterday, as the National Institutes of Health and New York University convened

a 25-nation conference on German measles immunization.

Reports will be presented today and Thursday on at least three competing vaccines, all being screened for possible use. The point will be to prevent German measles in pregnant women, because affected mothers may produce deformed babies.

The urgency of developing a vaccine became clearer than ever as NIH Dr. John L. Sever reported that the danger to pregnant women is not confined to the first three months of their pregnancy—the first trimester, medically speaking—as has been thought.

The damage to the babies they carry is almost as great if they develop it in pregnancy's second three months.

This means, Sever said, that another 20,000 babies may have been damaged in addition to the previously estimated 20,000 born with birth defects during the 1964 U.S. epidemic.

These second-trimester defects include a high percentage of hearing problems and mental retardation.

MUST SEEK THEM OUT

"We will really begin to get an idea of their extent," Sever said, when these 1964 babies start going to school this year and next. Meanwhile, he urged in an interview: "We've got to seek them out. They may be going along unrecognized and unassisted."

Sever and colleagues—including Dr. Janet B. Hardy of Johns Hopkins—studied 6161 of 1964's pregnancies. Among these, 128 women developed clearly diagnosed German measles.

Of 42 who caught it in the first trimester, seven (12 per cent) had babies with two or more serious defects—commonly eye and heart defects, often associated with mental and motor (movement) retardation. Of 58 who got the disease in the second trimester, six (nearly 10 per cent) had double defects—mainly mental and motor retardation, hearing loss and some cases of damage to the main artery feeding the heart.

OUTLOOK BRIGHT

The hope of future prevention?

Very good, said Dr. Saul Krugman of NYU, conference chairman, at a news conference. "I would hope we'll have a vaccine before the fall, if all goes well," he said.

He and Dr. Daniel I. Mullally, chief of the vaccine development branch, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Disease, outlined the reasons at a news conference. An estimated 100,000 persons, mainly children, have been given trial vaccine throughout the world. HVP 77 vaccine, developed at NIH's Division of Biological Standards, stopped a Taiwan epidemic cold.

At least two vaccines—HVP 77 and a Cendehill vaccine produced by the Belgian subsidiary of Smith Kline & French—have been proving both safe and effective in extensive trials. Another vaccine, produced at Philadelphia's Wistar Institute, has had less extensive U.S. tests, but it also is a serious contender.

NO LICENSING PREDICTION

Krugman would not predict which vaccine would be licensed first or just when that would happen.

But an informed NIH source said: "This conference was called for a specific purpose: to try to get all the facts together so a licensing judgment can be made. It will be made just as soon as possible, possibly two months away, no more than three or four months away, I would think."

Discussion at the NIH conference will include one important problem in rubella vaccines. Like the disease itself, they often cause temporary arthritis or arthralgia (joint pains), especially in women. They may cause it in a third to nearly half of women vaccinated. The symptoms are usually fleeting, but occasionally are painful ones lasting three to six weeks.

Partly for this reason, partly for others,

the first rubella vaccinations may be shots for millions of children, and not women at all.

Children transmit the disease to adults, Krugman explained. Vaccinations of children alone have nearly wiped out ordinary measles in both children and adults. The first German measles vaccine supplies will be limited, furthermore, and "probably 90 per cent" of all U.S. women are probably immune to German measles today. The vaccine would be wasted on them.

Will there be a 1970 epidemic? Possibly, believe some public health experts, because peaks of the disease recur in a six-to-nine-year cycle. "I'd predict not," Krugman said. "But I may have to eat my words."

"NO" VOTE IS RECALLED

(Mr. ASHBROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have received a great deal of criticism for voting "no" on many of the bills which come before this body. I am frank to say that I have voted against most of the programs which have made it necessary to increase taxes, raise debt ceilings, and run the Nation's business into deeper debt all of the time.

Recently, the Congress has received criticism about the Federal pay increases. While I have always felt that the President's salary should be increased and other high officials should probably carry higher salaries, I strongly feel that the recent back-door pay boosts were out of line with the realities of our fiscal situation and weakened our ability to affirmatively check inflation. It will be hard to tell others they should live within a 3- or 4-percent increase when we get a 41-percent increase.

How did it happen? Let us go back a few years. I have always supported the moderate pay increases for our postal workers and Federal employees which have been offered. There is no question in my mind that the cost-of-living increases have been justified. I voted against the pay increase in 1967 and my friends in the Federal service were quick to express their disappointment.

A typical letter I received was from my good friend, John Feasel, an officer in the Ohio Federation of United Postal Clerks. Mr. Feasel lives in Ashland and, in part, wrote the following:

Needless to say, I was quite disappointed when you voted against our pay raise. I was so positive that you were with us all the way and talked to my fellow postal workers in this vein all summer. You can just imagine the ribbing I took when the vote was announced. The ribbing was not important, but I would like to ask, "Why?" I feel that I probably know part of the answer but I want to hear it from you, please.

In my reply to John Feasel I pointed out that, as in many other bills, the issue becomes more complicated than just a straight pay increase of a few percent for those loyal federal employees who deserved it. This is always the problem of a Congressman. The votes are rarely on one simple issue but are usually complex. In the 1964 civil rights bill, as an example, I favored two important sections but opposed others. You always have to weigh the pro and con and vote accordingly. In this case, I was abso-

lutely certain it was necessary to vote against it just as I did in the 1964 civil rights bill.

To Mr. Feasel's letter, I sent the following reply on November 16, 1967:

The so-called quadrennial commission was totally objectionable. I have always told my friends in the postal service that I would support pay increase legislation if it did not include Members of Congress and top government officials. This was a backdoor approach which I think was absolutely wrong. Everybody who voted for the bill was in effect voting for a substantial pay increase to top government employees at a time when we are running a \$30 billion deficit. For this reason, more than any other, I made every effort to separate this provision from the bill and when it failed, I voted against it on final passage.

All right, I took the heat on my vote and probably made a few friends mad. I will now ask these friends and my constituents who was right and who was wrong on this issue? On October 11, 1967, the House of Representatives had H.R. 7977 before it. It was a pay increase bill but it also had this quadrennial commission tagged on to it. I immediately understood exactly what it would do—it would give a backdoor pay boost to top officials without a vote of the Members of Congress. We endeavored to have this section removed and on a vote of 199 to 211 were defeated. One hundred and thirty-five Republicans and only 64 Democrats joined in this economy vote with 191 Democrats joining only 45 Republicans in voting for the backdoor commission.

On final passage, having lost this vote, I clearly had the responsibility to vote against the bill even though I favored what might be considered as 95 percent of it. The 5 percent simply outweighed the other good features. The bill passed, 319 to 89 after this critical motion to recommit had been lost. That is the story of how the pay raises of February 14, 1969, came about and it is up to the people themselves to decide who voted for it and who voted against it.

In my experience here, you have to take the knocks when it is necessary to vote in a way that seems unpopular at the time but I feel my constituents can understand just how this happened and know that my vote was a right one in 1967.

What was wrong with the quadrennial commission, you ask? Simply this, it empowered the President to set up a panel of citizens who would recommend levels of pay for the Congress, the Cabinet, the Supreme Court, and judiciary. These recommendations when forwarded from the President to the Congress would go into effect automatically in 30 days unless either the Senate or the House take affirmative action to specifically rescind them. A neat trick. Instead of being confronted with the onerous duty of voting for or against our own pay increase, it would go into effect automatically by the simple expedient of the Congress not taking any action at all. I think this aspect of the recent pay boost controversy, more than any other, upset the people back home. I agree with them and did all I could in 1967, but, like so many other areas, must frankly admit I failed to stop the steam roller.

THREAT TO SOYBEAN PRODUCERS

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, those of us in the Congress representing soybean producing areas have been greatly concerned over a report that the European Economic Community is about to propose a tax on oilseeds and oilseed products. Such a tax would have a serious impact on farm income as well as the U.S. balance of payments and I wrote letters to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of State expressing my concern and urging that every effort be made to impress upon the EEC the serious nature of this threat.

I was pleased to receive a response from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. J. Phil Campbell, advising me that the Department has taken an extremely strong position in opposition to the tax. I also received a similar response from the Department of State and I place this exchange of correspondence in the RECORD at this point:

JANUARY 28, 1969.

HON. CLIFFORD M. HARDIN,
Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you probably know, there is a great deal of concern among soybean producers throughout the country over a report that the European Economic Community is about to propose a tax on vegetable oil and meal.

As I am sure you can appreciate, such a tax would have a definite and adverse effect on American exports of soybeans and soybean products to the E.E.C.

This action, if it takes place, appears to be a flagrant violation of the Agreement in the Kennedy Round to assure that soybeans would be duty free and I just wanted to express my deep concern and urge that every effort be made by those in your shop responsible for trade negotiations to impress upon the E.E.C. the seriousness of this threat.

Any information or comments you might have would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., February 14, 1969.

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MICHEL: Thank you for your letter of January 28, 1969, informing about the concern among U.S. soybean producers over the European Community's proposal to place a consumption tax on oilseeds and oilseed products.

As you may know, on December 19, 1968, the Commission of the European Community submitted to the Council of Ministers (the Community's Executive Body) its long awaited policy program to reform the agricultural sector, including specific provisions relating to fats and oils. The Commission proposes to introduce a tax of \$60 per metric ton on vegetable and marine oils and \$30 per ton on meals and to take the initiative in launching negotiations for an international arrangement for fats and oils. Such measures ostensibly designed to stabilize the edible fats and oils market, particularly butter, are in fact designed to plug the hole in the otherwise highly protective wall of their Common Agricultural Policy through which oilseeds and high-protein meals enter duty free without restriction.

We consider this to be the most important trade problem that has arisen in agriculture

between the United States and the European Community because of the magnitude of our trade in oilseeds and oilseed products—nearly \$500 million in 1967/68 and expanding. Impairment of our access to the important European market would have a serious impact on farm incomes and on the U.S. balance of payments. In addition, it is another example of the Community's policy of shifting most of the burden of supply adjustment to third countries through intensification of import restrictions and export aids. We have, therefore, taken an extremely strong position in opposition to the tax.

The U.S. Government has continuously and forcefully warned the European Community that their proposed tax would sharply reduce the Community's imports of oilseeds and oilseed products and would result in a massive impairment of the present access available to American exporters. We made it clear that we could not agree to any action or subscribe to any arrangement which would limit our export opportunities, or deny to us the benefit of concessions negotiated under GATT. We also made it clear that such action would leave us no choice but to retaliate promptly to restore the balance of concessions. You may have seen in newspaper stories the thought that our retaliation might include such important exports as European automobiles, typewriters, office equipment, wines, and similar items that Americans buy from them in large amounts.

What we, in fact, are saying to the European Community is that the enactment of a consumption tax on oilseed products could lead to the most serious trade policy confrontation between the Community and the United States with commercial and political implications extending beyond agriculture.

We will continue to make representations to the Community through all available channels to keep unimpaired our access to Community markets for our oilseeds and oilseed products.

Our latest information is that the Council of Ministers is not likely to act on the proposal in its present form. Final action, if any, is not expected to be taken in the immediate future.

Sincerely,

J. PHIL CAMPBELL,
Acting Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., February 6, 1969.

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MICHEL: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of January 28 regarding your concern about the tax the European Community is considering on vegetable oil and meal.

The Department of State shares your concern. We have made very clear to the European Community our opposition to the proposed tax. We presented a diplomatic note to the Commission of the Community expressing our grave concern and warning that, if the tax should be adopted, we would act swiftly to restore the balance of trade concessions between us. The note was followed up by a personal letter from Ambassador Roth, then the President's Special Trade Representative, to Commission President Jean Rey. Our Ambassador to the Community also met with President Rey and explained the danger of a US/EC confrontation implicit in the proposed taxes. In addition, our Embassies in the Six Member States have explained our position to their host Governments.

The tax has not yet been formally presented for adoption. If it is presented, its consideration is likely to be a lengthy process. We will continue to follow this matter very closely and to take all appropriate steps to protect the market for our soybeans in the European Community.

We appreciate your interest and hope you find the above information helpful.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, JR.,
Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations.

CHRISTINE CASEY: "FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE"

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, every year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year, over 400,000 school students participated in an essay contest whose theme was "Freedom's Challenge." These students are competing for scholarships which are awarded as top prizes.

The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., as a guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to be on hand for the final judging.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars for this most worthwhile program. I am proud to say that the winning speech from the State of New Hampshire was written by a young lady from my district, Miss Christine Casey, of Penacook, N.H., expresses her sentiments on a whole range of problems and challenges which face our great Nation. I am pleased to share her essay with my colleagues in the House today, as follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE (By Christine Casey)

In a country that thrives on democratic ideals every man becomes confronted by a certain question. What does he want to do with his life? Pleasure and success are very naturally two goals, but alone they do not constitute purposeful living. A meaningful life becomes such as a result of conscious effort towards awareness. The value of awareness becomes tangible in a man's service to his fellow man and to his country. This is freedom's challenge.

Awareness begins when a man evaluates his abilities, his achievements, and his goals—when he asks, "What am I able to do?" "What have I done?" and "What shall I strive for?" Then he reaches beyond his own small realm with a genuine concern for mankind. Poverty, hunger, war and injustice will surely greet his searching. But perhaps most painful to realize will be those things that should be but are not present. A United States Senator expressed it in these words, "Some men see things as they are and say Why? I dream things that never were and say, Why not?" The awareness of basic human needs is a step towards answering freedom's challenge.

Becoming sensitive to the deficiencies in our society is only half the goal, however. Concern must be translated into tangible form—into action and service. And now the question returns: What does a man want to do with his life? It is the answer to this question that determines what substance we give to our lives.

There are as many ways to answer the challenge to serve as there are people. Some may find the way in the business world, in doing their job well, what ever it is, so that life runs a bit more smoothly because of their efforts. Even a mother in her home can contribute to the good of man by being active in her community and helping her children to become fully developed individuals. Each one of us is only one, but there is something each can do.

Poverty, hunger, war, and injustice—all are tremendous and frightening forces. These social ills can be remedied only when people do become aware of the needs of the world in which they live and if their awareness leads to effective service. Poverty is the Appalachian miner who finds no longer any demand for his skills. Hunger is the Biafran child in a refugee camp waiting for the war to end. War is the young soldier who has left behind him a wife and a young child. Injustice is the Harlem boy trapped two blocks away from the opportunity to achieve success.

Each of us, in service, must give our understanding, we must share our material blessings, and we must dedicate our lives. Freedom is a precious and wonderful possession that brings with it a challenge that many men and women, great and small, have willingly accepted.

CLEVELAND AND WYMAN: "THOSE WHO FEAST ROYALLY ON FEDERAL FUNDS SHOULD GIVE FREEDOM A HELPING HAND"

(Mr. CLEVELAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from the First District of New Hampshire, and I are most concerned by the attitude of some of the colleges and universities toward the Reserve Officers Training Corps. We expressed this concern today in a letter to the Secretary of Defense. I think this concern reflects the view of most Members and therefore, under unanimous consent, I offer our letter at this point in the RECORD.

HON. MELVIN LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On behalf of ourselves personally and also constituents, we are deeply concerned by the current actions taken by certain educational institutions which appear to threaten an effective ROTC program.

Consideration of national defense prompts us to urge your careful review of this entire matter. We have been informed that more than half of our officer strength originates from ROTC.

It is our understanding that many of the institutions involved have contracts with the Department of Defense. We would hope that these would be reviewed and that the letter and spirit of these contracts be enforced.

We appreciate that improvements in the ROTC program may be in order; however, we are also aware of the enormous amount of direct and indirect Federal assistance which many of these educational institutions are receiving. It seems incredible to us that these institutions that pride themselves on academic freedom and feasting royally on Federal funds, can be so unmindful of the requirements of our national defense to preserve freedom in the world today.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS C. WYMAN,
First District, New Hampshire.
JAMES C. CLEVELAND,
Second District, New Hampshire.

PANAMA CANAL MODERNIZATION: TIME FOR ACTION HAS COME

(Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on many previous occasions I have addressed this body concerning the vital subject of the Panama Canal. Although there is very little of basic nature that has not been previously stated, the passage of time has sharpened our perspective and the assumption of office by a new administration makes necessary a reappraisal of the canal question in the light of the realistic considerations involved.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would stress that, since the issues are fundamental, they transcend all partisan considerations and must be handled on the highest plane of statesmanship if our course is to be a wise one.

The principal questions in the inter-oceanic canal problem are:

First, the safeguarding of our indispensable sovereign rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone for the efficient maintenance, operation, sanitation, protection, and military defense of the Panama Canal; also the security of the Western Hemisphere.

Second, the increase of capacity and operational improvement of the existing canal through the major modification of the authorized third locks project under what is known as the Terminal Lake third locks solution.

Third, the matter of a second canal.

As to the first of the above three points, the Panama Canal is the strategic center of the Americas indispensable for hemispheric defense. Through an ill-advised policy of retreat at Panama and an unwarranted obsession with the glamorous old dream of a sea level canal, the executive branch of our Government has endangered our juridical status on the isthmus and proposed impossible treaty concessions to Panama. These, if adopted, would inevitably bring about chaos and disaster on the isthmus, with a total loss of our investment in the canal enterprise. This investment, including defense, from 1904 through June 30, 1968, was \$6,368,009,000. Total recoveries during the same period were \$1,359,931,421.66, which sum is only a small portion of the overall investment, making a net investment of over \$5,000,000,000.

Fortunately, in 1967 the texts of the proposed giveaway treaties were published and some 150 Members of the House of Representatives introduced resolutions opposing their ratification. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would invite special attention of the Congress to the fact that the U.S. treaty negotiating team headed by Ambassador Robert B. Anderson ignored the provision of article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the U.S. Constitution which vests the power to dispose of territory and other property of the United States in the Congress and not in the Senate and executive alone. In either case, Ambassador Anderson and his diplomatic associates revealed their disregard of this vital provision of the Constitution or else sought to conceal it.

In regard to the second point about increasing canal transit capacity, a total of \$76,357,405 was expended on the suspended third locks project, largely for huge lock site excavations at Gatun and Miraflores, which are usable in the modernization program espoused by other

Members of Congress and myself. In addition, the enlargement of Gaillard Cut at an estimated cost of \$81,257,097 is due for completion in 1971. These two projects together totaling more than \$157 million represent substantial commitments by our Government for the major increase of capacity of the existing canal—too large an expenditure to be disregarded.

With respect to the third point, Public Law 88-609 authorized a study of the feasibility of constructing a new canal of so-called sea-level design. The reporting date for this study has been extended to December 1, 1970. As pointed out by Senator STROM THURMOND, a careful student of canal problems, in a statement to the U.S. Senate on March 6, 1968, the studies authorized by Public Law 88-609 are of sea level projects and that consideration under it of high-level lake and lock plan does violence to the authorizing statute. Moreover, extensive clarifications in the Congress as to the relative merits of the various canal proposals justify the abandonment of the idea of a sea-level canal and informed congressional opinion concerning the current inquiry is that it is a sheer waste of money.

In line with past practices of mine, after adjournment of the 90th Congress, I made a voyage to the West Coast of South America via the Panama Canal. On the way south, my ship stopped at Balboa, thus affording me an opportunity for discussions with Canal Zone residents and briefings by Panama Canal and military authorities. On the return voyage, Balboa Harbor was so crowded that my ship could not lay over at the Pacific end of the canal as desired but had to transit to the Atlantic. If there had been a summit-level terminal lake at the Pacific end, as there should be, my ship could have laid over at Balboa. Because of the indicated anchorage lack in the Pacific sector of the canal, I would reemphasize as forcefully as possible the tremendous need for such additional anchorage in line with provisions of measures now before the Congress for effectuating the improved third locks project.

Mr. Speaker, those on the Isthmus with whom I discussed canal problems during my recent visit there are well informed. They presented views derived from long experience in the maintenance, operation and defense of our vital artery of commerce in an area of endemic revolution and endless political turmoil, which is especially vulnerable to communistic revolutionary subversion.

After return to Washington, I received a number of letters from the Isthmus expressing appreciation for my interest and suggesting that instead of my having been briefed by those there they should have been briefed by me. In fact, there was a mutual briefing. For the compliment involved, I am very grateful.

In this connection, I wish to invite attention of the Congress, especially of new Members, to the volume of my addresses on "Isthmian Canal Policy Questions," published as House Document No. 474, 89th Congress. This volume, which is based upon careful research and experience over several years of recent canal history, contains a wealth of au-

thentic information on significant aspects of the canal problem.

Returning to my recent visit in the Canal Zone, I would like to summarize informed opinion there as regards the current studies and as to what should be done by our Government as follows:

First, that there is no need for a second interoceanic canal.

Second, that construction of a sea level project in the Canal Zone should not be undertaken.

Third, that the well known Terminal Lake-third locks plan for the existing canal provides the wisest solution of the canal problem and is best for Panama as well as for the United States.

Fourth, that undiluted U.S. sovereignty and ownership over the Canal Zone territory and canal must be retained.

Fifth, that the proposed new treaties of the last national administration providing for complete surrender to Panama of the present canal, as well as a like surrender of any future canal that would be built at tremendous cost to our taxpayers, should be summarily rejected and that authorization should be promptly enacted by the Congress for completion of the informed third locks project.

Mr. Speaker, during the fiscal year 1968, the Panama Canal transited 15,511 vessels. Any waterway that handles such a volume of traffic is not obsolete but efficient. In fact, the canal is more efficient now than when it was opened to traffic in 1914, for efficiency and obsolescence are entirely opposite in character. The canal is, however, approaching saturation of capacity and the time has come for our Government to provide for the necessary increase of facilities as developed from years of operating experience.

To this end, appropriate bills have been introduced in the Congress and are now pending. These measures, if and when enacted, will obviate the necessity for any further study of "sea level" canals. Moreover, they will provide a simple, commonsense, historically based solution that does not require a new treaty with Panama, thus enabling continued undiluted U.S. sovereignty and control of the canal and its protective frame of the Canal Zone and the clearing up of the entire canal situation, all at the least cost to our taxpayers. When the improved third locks project is thus completed it will provide for the needs of world shipping for a great many years. The needs of the present and expanding economy of Panama will be met, Panama will retain its independence, the Canal Zone kept out of Soviet hands, and the security of the United States, the Western Hemisphere and the entire free world will be safeguarded.

Mr. Speaker, these are paramount considerations that cannot be obscured by any amount of sophistry or self-serving propaganda on the part of fatuous thinkers and partisan advocates of the old idea of a so-called sea level canal.

The full text of H.R. 3792 follows:

H.R. 3792

A bill to provide for the increase of capacity and the improvement of operations of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this

Act may be cited as the "Panama Canal Modernization Act".

SEC. 2. (a) The Governor of the Canal Zone, under the supervision of the Secretary of the Army, is authorized and directed to prosecute the work necessary to increase the capacity and improve the operations of the Panama Canal through the adaptation of the Third Locks project set forth in the report of the Governor of the Panama Canal, dated February 24, 1939 (House Document Numbered 210, Seventy-sixth Congress), and authorized to be undertaken by the Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), with usable lock dimensions of not less than one hundred and forty feet by not less than one thousand two hundred feet by not less than forty-five feet, and including the following: elimination of the Pedro Miguel Locks, and consolidation of all Pacific locks near Miraflores in new lock structures to correspond with the locks capacity at Gatun, raise the summit water level to its optimum height of approximately ninety-two feet, and provide a summit-level lake anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal, together with such appurtenant structures, works, and facilities, and enlargements or improvements of existing channels, structures, works, and facilities, as may be deemed necessary, at an estimated total cost not to exceed \$850,000,000, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated for this purpose.

(b) The provisions of the second sentence and the second paragraph of the Act of August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), shall apply with respect to the work authorized by subsection (a) of this section. As used in such Act, the terms "Governor of the Panama Canal", "Secretary of War", and "Panama Railroad Company" shall be held and considered to refer to the "Governor of the Canal Zone", "Secretary of the Army", and "Panama Canal Company", respectively, for the purposes of this Act.

(c) In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Governor of the Canal Zone may act and exercise his authority as President of the Panama Canal Company and may utilize the services and facilities of that company.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a board, to be known as the "Panama Canal Advisory and Inspection Board" (hereinafter referred to as the "Board").

(b) The Board shall be composed of five members who are citizens of the United States of America. Members of the Board shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows:

(1) one member from private life, experienced and skilled in private business (including engineering);

(2) two members from private life, experienced and skilled in the science of engineering;

(3) one member who is a commissioned officer of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army (retired); and

(4) one member who is a commissioned officer of the line, United States Navy (retired).

(c) The President shall designate as Chairman of the Board one of the members experienced and skilled in the science of engineering.

(d) The President shall fill each vacancy on the Board in the same manner as the original appointment.

(e) The Board shall cease to exist on that date designated by the President as the date on which it works under this Act is completed.

(f) The Chairman of the Board shall be paid basic pay at the rate provided for level II of the Executive Schedule in section 5313 of title 5, United States Code. The other members of the Board appointed from pri-

vate life shall be paid basic pay at a per annum rate which is \$500 less than the rate of basic pay of the Chairman. The members of the Board who are retired officers of the United States Army and the United States Navy each shall be paid at a rate of basic pay which, when added to his pay as a retired officer, will establish his total rate of pay from the United States at a per annum rate which is \$500 less than the rate of basic pay of the Chairman.

(g) The Board shall appoint, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, a Secretary and such other personnel as may be necessary to carry out its functions and activities and shall fix their rates of basic pay in accordance with chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. The Secretary and other personnel of the Board shall serve at the pleasure of the Board.

SEC. 4. (a) The Board is authorized and directed to study and review all plans and designs for the Third Locks project referred to in section 2(a) of this Act, to make on-the-site studies and inspections of the Third Locks project, and to obtain current information on all phases of planning and construction with respect to such project. The Governor of the Canal Zone shall furnish and make available to the Board at all times current information with respect to such plans, designs, and construction. No construction work shall be commenced at any stage of the Third Locks project unless the plans and designs for such work, and all changes and modifications of such plans and designs, have been submitted by the Governor of the Canal Zone to, and have had the prior approval of, the Board. The Board shall report promptly to the Governor of the Canal Zone the results of its studies and reviews of all plans and designs, including changes and modifications thereof, which have been submitted to the Board by the Governor of the Canal Zone, together with its approval or disapproval thereof, or its recommendations for changes or modifications thereof, and its reasons therefor.

(b) The Board shall submit to the President and to the Congress an annual report covering its activities and functions under this Act and the progress of the work on the Third Locks project and may submit, in its discretion, interim reports to the President and to the Congress with respect to these matters.

SEC. 5. For the purpose of conducting all studies, reviews, inquiries, and investigations deemed necessary by the Board in carrying out its functions and activities under this Act, the Board is authorized to utilize any official reports, documents, data, and papers in the possession of the United States Government and its officials; and the Board is given power to designate and authorize any member, or other personnel, of the Board, to administer oaths and affirmations, subpoena witnesses, take evidence, procure information and data, and require the production of any books, papers, or other documents and records which the Board may deem relevant or material to the performance of the functions and activities of the Board. Such attendance of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, may be required from any place in the United States, or any territory, or any other area under the control or jurisdiction of the United States, including the Canal Zone.

SEC. 6. In carrying out its functions and activities under this Act, the Board is authorized to obtain the services of experts and consultants or organizations thereof in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not in excess of \$200 per diem.

SEC. 7. Upon request of the Board, the head of any department, agency, or establishment

in the executive branch of the Federal Government is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis, for such period or periods as may be agreed upon by the Board and the head of the department, agency, or establishment concerned, any of the personnel of such department, agency, or establishment to assist the Board in carrying out its functions and activities under this Act.

SEC. 8. The Board may use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

SEC. 9. The Administrator of General Services or the President of the Panama Canal Company, or both, shall provide, on a reimbursable basis, such administrative support services for the Board as the Board may request.

SEC. 10. The Board may make expenditures for travel and subsistence expenses of members and personnel of the Board in accordance with chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, for rent of quarters at the seat of government and in the Canal Zone, and for such printing and binding as the Board deems necessary to carry out effectively its functions and activities under this Act.

SEC. 11. All expenses of the Board shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Board or by such other member or employee of the Board as the Chairman may designate.

SEC. 12. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Board each fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to carry out its functions and activities under this Act.

SEC. 13. Any provision of the Act of August 11, 1939 (54 Stat. 1409; Public Numbered 391, Seventy-sixth Congress), or of any other statute, inconsistent with any provision of this Act is superseded, for the purposes of this Act, to the extent of such inconsistency.

TREATYMAKING POWER: CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT FOR INCLUSION OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, among the historic achievements of the people of the United States were the acquisition of the Canal Zone territory and the construction of the Panama Canal. Undertaken as a mandate of civilization for the benefit of world commerce and for hemispheric defense, this great inter-oceanic link has become indispensable as the strategic center of the Americas, shortening the trade routes of the world. The total expenditures of the taxpayers of our country from 1904 through June 30, 1968, on the canal enterprise, including defense, were \$6,368,009,000. Total recoveries during the same period were \$1,359,931,421.66, making a net investment of over \$5,000,000,000, all supplied by taxes imposed upon our citizens.

It was, therefore, with genuine shock that the people of the United States and the Congress in June 1967 learned of the completion of negotiations between the Governments of the United States and Panama for three proposed new Panama Canal treaties that would cede sovereignty over the Canal Zone to Panama, make that small and unstable country a partner in the management and defense of the canal, and eventually give to Pan-

ama not only the existing canal but as well any new canal constructed by the United States in Panama at our taxpayers' cost to replace it.

Reactions to these monstrous proposals were prompt, with some 150 Members of the House introducing or cosponsoring resolutions opposing the treaties. Important national organizations, among them the American Legion, likewise adopted strong resolutions in opposition to the projected giveaway of U.S. territory and property.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would emphasize that the founders of our country, when framing the Constitution, realized the danger of the Executive and the Senate alienating territory and property of the United States by treaty without congressional sanction. Moreover, they wisely included in article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution a vital provision vesting the power to dispose of territory and other property of the United States in the Congress and not in the President and the Senate alone.

As could have been expected by those familiar with constitutional history, the ignoring of this provision by our negotiators in 1967 served to focus wide attention on the treaty-making power of our Government, which is vested in the President and the Senate; and many thoughtful students of government have urged that the House of Representatives be included in this important function.

A study of the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention discloses that the inclusion of the House in the treaty-making power was considered by the framers of the document but not adopted because it was felt that the required secrecy would be more difficult to maintain.

The membership of the First Congress consisted of 26 Senators and 65 Representatives. Today, the Senate has more Members than the Senate and House combined in 1789. Moreover, the organizational structure of both Houses is such as to safeguard classified information.

From these facts, it is obvious that the historic reasons for noninclusion of the House of Representatives in the treaty-making power no longer apply. Moreover there are paramount reasons why the House should be included. Among them are:

First, the origination in the House of revenue bills to implement treaties requiring appropriations;

Second, the Constitutional requirement for congressional authorization for the disposal of U.S. territory and property; and

Third, the more intimate relationship of the House to the electorate. Also there has been in recent years, as there will undoubtedly be in the future, the practice of some elements in our Government to attempt to do by treaty what could never be accomplished by legislation, under the fallacious contention that treaties do not have to conform to the Constitution but need only to be made under the authority of the United States. Coupled with this there has grown up in the executive department the scheme of arranging for international Executive agreements as substitutes for treaties,

thus damaging the constitutional processes and reducing the power of the Senate.

To meet the situation as so clearly represented by the proposed Panama Canal treaties, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 394, which provides for the inclusion of the House of Representatives in the treaty-making power and have urged all of my colleagues in the House to introduce or cosponsor like resolutions.

In order that the Congress and the Nation may be fully informed in the premises, I quote as part of my remarks the indicated resolution and a June 12, 1967, pamphlet prepared at my request by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress in "The Treaty-making Power in the Constitution."

H.J. RES. 394

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring the advice and consent of the House of Representatives in making of treaties

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE

"No treaty with respect to which the advice and consent of the Senate is required by section 2 of article II of this Constitution may be made without the advice and consent of the House of Representatives, two-thirds of the Representatives present concurring."

THE TREATY-MAKING POWER IN THE CONSTITUTION: A SUMMARY OF THE HISTORY RELATING TO THE NONINCLUSION OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

BACKGROUND

At the Constitutional Convention of 1787 in Philadelphia, the decision concerning how treaties would be made was only a small part of the basic task of devising an effective federal government. The eventual wording of section 2 of Article II that the President, "shall have power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur" reflected the check and balance system which emerged. It also reflected the differences and compromises among the large and small states and those in favor of a strong national government and those concerned with protecting the rights and interests of individual states.

Prior to the Revolutionary War, the foreign relations of the thirteen colonies had been primarily conducted by Great Britain, where the king made treaties and the parliament was not involved unless the treaty needed further implementing legislation. Executive control was the prevailing practice throughout Europe, and one factor in the debates on the treaty-making power was that American representatives would be negotiating with diplomats representing and instructed by the king who would also later ratify any treaty negotiated. However, the Americans were establishing a unique system of government and prevailing practice was modified or abandoned as needed to suit the aims of a democratic, federal republic.

The Articles of Confederation vested the treaty-making power in Congress and required the assent of nine states. Written in 1776 and 1777, and formally entering into effect in 1781, the articles formed the basis of

the relationship between the colonies until superseded by the Constitution in 1789. During this period the Congress consisted of delegates appointed by the state legislatures, each with an equal vote, and there was no executive. Although the Confederation Congress later established a Department of Foreign Affairs, it maintained tight control over the Secretary and issued instructions to the negotiators of treaties. Several treaties were concluded with the Continental and then the Confederation Congress in charge of both the negotiating and the ratifying of treaties.¹

The Articles of Confederation proved inadequate for the basic task of maintaining sufficient cooperation and unity among the states, and particularly for financing the activities of the national government. In regard to treaties, the main problem which emerged concerned the inability of the Central Government to enforce treaty stipulations, particularly those relating to the collection of debts due to British subjects.² The framers of the Constitution were intent and agreed upon correcting this situation, which accounts for including treaties among the supreme law of the land. The procedure for making treaties, which is the subject of this report, did not appear to be a matter of either great unanimity or great debate.

HISTORY OF THE TREATY-MAKING CLAUSE AT THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

Soon after the Constitutional Convention was convened on May 25, 1787, Governor Edmund Randolph of Virginia presented a series of resolutions subsequently known as the Virginia Plan. These resolutions, which formed the main basis for discussion at the Convention and represented the views of the larger states, did not specify how treaties were to be made, referring to treaties only to say that the national legislatures ought to be empowered "to negative all laws passed by the several states, contravening, in the opinion of the national legislatures the articles of Union, or any treaty subsisting under the authority of the union. . . ."

The other major basis of discussion, the New Jersey Plan, which the smaller states proposed as a substitute for the Virginia plan, similarly did not specify how treaties were to be made. It referred to treaties only in connection with the judiciary's authority in the construction of treaties and to provide that treaties shall be the supreme law of the respective states, and that federal authority could be called forth to enforce and compel obedience to the observance of treaties.

However, it has been pointed out that in both plans it was probably assumed that Congress would continue to make treaties as it had under the Articles of Confederation. The New Jersey Plan, for example, specified that the powers granted to Congress under it were in addition to those which had been granted under the articles of Confederation.⁴

Two plans which did not form the basis of substantial discussion⁵ did provide for the treaty-making power. In a draft plan of government presented to the Constitutional Convention on May 29, 1787 by Charles Pinckney of South Carolina, the Senate was given the sole and exclusive power to make treaties as well as to declare war, and appoint ambassadors and other ministers to foreign nations.⁶ On June 18 Alexander Hamilton presented a plan in which the chief executive, the Governor, would have "with the advice and approbation of the Senate the power of making all treaties."⁷

THE FIRST DRAFT

The first draft of the Constitution gave treaty-making power to the Senate alone. Reported on August 6, 1787, by a Committee of Detail established to prepare a text based on the proceedings to that time, Art. IX, sec. I of the first draft said:

"The Senate of the U.S. shall have power

Footnotes at end of article.

to make treaties, and to appoint Ambassadors, and Judges of the Supreme Court."

When this provision was debated on August 23, 1787, James Madison of Virginia pointed out that the Senate represented the States alone and that for "this as well as other obvious reasons" the President should be an agent in treaties.⁹

Gouverneur Morris of Pennsylvania questioned whether the making of treaties should be referred to the Senate at all, and proposed an amendment adding "but no Treaty shall be binding on the U.S. which is not ratified by a law."¹⁰ Morris' amendment, which would have given both houses of the legislature a role in treaties, was defeated with eight states opposed and only Pennsylvania in favor.

In opposing the amendment requiring ratification of a treaty by a law, Nathaniel Gorham of Massachusetts stated that there would be many disadvantages if treaties of peace and all negotiations had to be ratified in advance, and that if they were not ratified in advance the Ministers would not know how to proceed and would have to go abroad instructed by a different authority than would ratify their proceedings, unlike other countries where the delegates were instructed by the same authority responsible for ratification.

One point of debate on the amendment concerned the effect on making a treaty of alliance. Madison suggested that it would be inconvenient to require a legal ratification of treaties of alliances or treaties for the purpose of war. Morris stated that for treaties of alliance the amendment would require that the foreign ministers be sent to the United States, which he thought was desirable because he was not "solicitous to multiply and facilitate Treaties. . . . The more difficulty in making treaties, the more value will be set on them."¹¹ On this point Gorham replied that negotiations at home, especially with the whole legislation involved, were undesirable because of the danger of corruption by the foreign Ambassadors. He said that "negotiations on the spot were not to be desired by us, especially if the whole Legislature is to have anything to do with Treaties. It will be generally influenced by two or three men, who will be corrupted by the Ambassadors here. In such a Government as ours it is necessary to guard against the Government itself being seduced."¹²

Speaking in behalf of the requirement for ratification by a law, James Wilson of Pennsylvania stated the view that without such an amendment the Senate alone could require "all the rice of South Carolina to be sent to some one particular port," and that the King of Great Britain was under the same fetters (of requiring subsequent legislation) on important Treaties which required Parliamentary action to execute them. John Dickinson of Delaware said he concurred that the amendment was safe and proper even though he recognized that it was unfavorable to the small states which in the original proposal would have an equal voice in Treaties.

On the other side, William Johnson of Connecticut thought it was somewhat improper that the acts of a Minister with plenipotentiary powers from one Body should depend upon ratification by another Body. He disagreed that the English case was similar, stating that the King had full power and if Parliament failed to provide the necessary means of executing the Treaty, it would be violated.

The clause was then referred back to the Committee on Detail, Randolph "observing that almost every Speaker had made objections to the clause as it stood,"¹³ and Madison suggesting that a distinction in the method of making treaties might be made between different kinds of treaties. He sug-

gested that the President and Senate might be allowed to make "Treaties eventual and of Alliance for limited terms" but that for other treaties the concurrence of the whole legislature be required.

THE SECOND DRAFT

On August 31, 1787, all unfinished parts of the Constitution, which included the clause on making treaties, were referred to a committee composed of one representative from each state. The language on the treaty-making power in the report presented by this committee on September 4, 1787, stated:

"The President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall have power to make Treaties. . . . But no treaty shall be made without the consent of two thirds of the members present."¹⁴

When this portion of the report was brought up for discussion on September 7, 1787, James Wilson of Pennsylvania immediately moved to add the words "and House of Representatives" after the word Senate. Since treaties were to have the operation of laws, he said, they should also have the sanction of laws. Any necessity for secrecy, so far as it was inconsistent with obtaining Legislative sanction, was outweighed by the necessity for this sanction.

Roger Sherman of Connecticut expressed the view that the only question was whether the power could be safely entrusted to the Senate, and that he believed it could, but the necessity of secrecy, he said, forbade a reference of treaties to the whole Legislature. The motion to include the House of Representatives was defeated, with only Pennsylvania voting in favor and New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia voting against.

The second clause of the sentence, "But no treaty shall be made without the consent of two-thirds of the members present" was then considered. Wilson of Pennsylvania objected to requiring a two-thirds majority on the grounds that it gave a minority the power to control the majority. Rufus King of Massachusetts supported this view, pointing out that there was already a check since the Executive was also involved.

At one point on September 7 an amendment by Madison to exempt treaties of peace from the regular procedure, so that they could be made more easily than other treaties, was adopted. However, agreement was not reached on what different procedure would be used for peace treaties. The convention defeated a motion by Madison to authorize two-thirds of the Senate to make peace treaties without the concurrence of the President. Madison said the President "would necessarily derive so much power and importance from a state of war that he might be tempted, if authorized to impede a treaty of peace." Pierce Butler of South Carolina concurred, expressing the belief that this was a precaution against ambitious and corrupt Presidents and pointing to the "late perfidious policy of the Statholder in Holland; and the artifices of the Duke of Marlboro to prolong the war of which he had the management."¹⁵

Others, however, did not agree to having the Senate alone responsible for making peace treaties. Gorham thought the precaution unnecessary since the means of carrying on the war would be in the hands of the Legislature, not the President. Gouverneur Morris thought the President's power would be harmless in this case and that no peace should be made without the agreement of the President who was the guardian of the national interests. Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts said that a greater proportion of votes, not a smaller, should be necessary in treaties of peace.

"In Treaties of peace the dearest interests will be at stake, as the fisheries, territory &c. In Treaties of peace also there is more

danger to the extremities of the Continent, of being sacrificed, than on any other occasions."¹⁶

The next day, however (September 8, 1787) the Convention agreed to a reconsideration of the entire clause. One member wanted to strike out the exception for treaties of peace. Points made by those in favor of continuing the exception for Treaties of Peace included (a) that if two-thirds of the Senate were required for making peace, the Legislature would be unwilling to make war for that reason on account of the "Fisheries or the Mississippi, the two great objects of the Union,"¹⁷ (b) that if a majority were for peace but were not allowed to make it they would be apt "to effect their purpose in the more disagreeable mode, of negating the supplies for the war,"¹⁸ (c) that if two-thirds were necessary to make peace, a minority might perpetuate war against the sense of the majority.

On the other hand, those in favor of requiring a two-thirds majority for treaties of peace as for all others contended that in the Senate there could be a majority of the states without a majority of the people, and that eight men who might be the majority of a quorum should not have the power to decide the conditions of peace. The exception for the Treaties of Peace was stricken out by an 8 to 3 vote, with only New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland in favor of retaining the exception.

Roger Sherman of Connecticut moved that no rights established by the Treaty of Peace should be ceded without the sanction of the Legislature. To this Madison observed that in the present Congress it had been too easy to make Treaties although nine states were required. (In connection with the observation by Madison, that it had been too easy to make Treaties, one authority has pointed out that at that time Treaties had been made with only six foreign countries.)¹⁹

Several other amendments were also defeated. Wilson of Pennsylvania and Dayton of New Jersey moved to strike out altogether the clause requiring two-thirds of the Senate, but this was defeated with all states opposed except Delaware. A motion by John Rutledge of South Carolina and Gerry to require the consent of two-thirds of all the members of the Senate was defeated with only North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia in favor, and a move by Roger Sherman of Connecticut and Gerry to require a majority of the whole number of the Senate was also defeated but by a small margin, with Massachusetts, Connecticut, Delaware, South Carolina, and Georgia in favor and New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Vermont, and North Carolina opposed. A move by Madison that a quorum of the Senate should consist of two-thirds of all the members was also defeated by a 5-6 vote, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware opposed and Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia in favor. A move by Hugh Williamson of North Carolina and Gerry that "no Treaty should be made without previous notice to the members and a reasonable time for their attending" was also defeated, with only North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia in favor. Then the clause on treaty-making in the Report of the Committee was passed, although Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Georgia voted against it.

A committee was then appointed to revise the style and arrangement of the articles which had been agreed to, and the text reported back by this committee was compared with the proceedings. As finally approved by the convention, section 2 of Article II stated as it does today:

"He [the President] shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

Footnotes at end of article.

ADDITIONAL REASONS GIVEN PRIOR TO ADOPTION OF THE CONSTITUTION

In the explanation and defense of the new Constitution propounded between the signing of the Constitution on September 17, 1787, and its ratification by the necessary nine state conventions and entry into force, further attention was given to the treaty-making procedures. Reasons for not including the House of Representatives along with the Senate and President in making treaties were elaborated to meet criticism which emerged on this point. A major criticism was that if treaties were to be part of the supreme law of the land, the entire legislature should participate; otherwise the President and Senate might legislate through treaties and fear was expressed that the interests of some, such as the navigation of the Mississippi, might be traded away for the interests of others, such as commercial concessions for the northern states.²⁰ There was also fear among some that the Senate might have been given too much power.

During this period a number of proposals were made for amendments which would have given the House of Representatives a role in making certain types of treaties at least.

For example, Patrick Henry suggested that "no treaty should be made without the consent of a considerable majority of both houses" and when Virginia ratified the Constitution, its legislature passed a resolution suggesting various amendments, one of which was that no commercial treaty should be ratified without the concurrence of two-thirds of the whole number of the Senate and specified treaties should require approval of three-fourths of both houses of Congress:

"... no treaty, ceding, contracting, restraining, or suspending, the territorial rights or claims of the United States, or any of them, or their, or any of their rights or claims to fishing in the American seas, or navigating the American rivers, shall be made, but in cases of the most urgent and extreme necessity; nor shall any such treaty be ratified without the concurrence of three fourths of the whole number of the members of both houses respectively."²¹

North Carolina suggested the same amendment prior to its ratification.

A conference at Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, in September 1788 petitioned the State legislature to obtain certain modifications of the Constitution, including an amendment to the "supreme law of the land" clause of Article VI which would require the assent of the House of Representatives for a treaty to alter or affect any law of the United States or a particular state. It said:

"That to article 6, clause 2, be added the following proviso, viz.: Provided always that no treaty, which shall hereafter be made, shall be deemed or construed to alter or affect any law of the United States, or of any particular state, until such treaty shall have been laid before and assented to by the House of Representatives in Congress."²²

None of the proposed amendments concerning treaties were submitted by Congress to the states for ratification.²³

The need for "secrecy and despatch" were perhaps the most frequently cited reasons for not giving the House of Representatives a role in treaty-making. It was apparently anticipated that in giving its advice and consent the Senate would actively participate in the making of treaties as well as in their ratification, because reference was often made to the necessity for secrecy in negotiations and the difficulty of maintaining secrecy in a large group such as the House of Representatives. Similarly, it was pointed out that it would be inefficient and expensive to require the legislature to be in session while a treaty was being negotiated, whereas the smaller Senate could be convened quickly.

The shorter term of the members of the House of Representatives and the anticipation of frequent turnover was another reason cited. It was claimed that Senators, who were elected for longer periods, would gain valuable experience and that their staggered terms would provide for a continuity which did not exist in the house. In addition, until later changed by amendment, the Senate was to be elected by state legislatures, and the view was expressed that this and the higher age requirement for the Senate would lead to a person more qualified for making treaties than the representatives elected by popular election.

John Jay, who had served as Secretary of Foreign Affairs during the period of the Confederation, wrote in the *Federalist*:

"The power of making treaties is an important one, especially as it relates to war, peace, and commerce; and it should not be delegated but in such a mode, and with such precautions, as will afford the highest security, that it will be exercised by men the best qualified for the purpose, and in a manner most conducive to the public good. The convention appear to have been attentive to both these points—they have directed the president to be chosen by select bodies of electors, to be deputed by the people for that express purpose; and they have committed the appointment of senators to the state legislatures. This mode has, in such cases, vastly the advantage of elections by the people in their collective capacity where the activity of party zeal, taking advantage of the supineness, the ignorance, the hopes, and fears of the unwary and interested, often places men in office, by the votes of a small proportion of the electors.

"... They who wish to commit the power under consideration to a popular assembly, composed of members constantly coming and going in quick succession, seem not to recollect that such a body must necessarily be inadequate to the attainment of those great objects, which require to be steadily contemplated in all their relations and circumstances, and which can only be approached and achieved by measures, which not only talents, but also exact information, and often much time, are necessary to concert and to execute. It was wise, therefore, in the convention to provide, not only that the power of making treaties should be committed to able and honest men, but also that they should continue in place a sufficient time to become perfectly acquainted with our national concerns, and to form and introduce a system for the management of them. The duration prescribed, is such as will give them an opportunity of greatly extending their political information, and of rendering their accumulating experience more and more beneficial to their country. Nor has the convention discovered less prudence in providing for the frequent elections of senators in such a way, as to obviate the inconvenience of periodically transferring those great affairs entirely to new men—for, by leaving a considerable residue of the old ones in place, uniformity and order, as well as a constant succession of official information, will be preserved.

"It seldom happens in the negotiation of treaties, of whatever nature, but that perfect secrecy and immediate dispatch are sometimes requisite. There are cases where the most useful intelligence may be obtained, if the persons possessing it can be relieved from apprehensions of discovery. ... The convention have done well, therefore, in so disposing of the power of making treaties, that although the president must, in forming them, act by the advice and consent of the senate, yet he will be able to manage the business of intelligence in such a manner as prudence may suggest.

"... they who have had much experience on this head inform us, that there frequently

are occasions when days, nay, even when hours are precious. ... For these the president will find no difficulty to provide; and should any circumstances occur, which requires the advice and consent of the senate, he may at any time convene them. Thus we see, that the constitution provides that our negotiations for treaties shall have every advantage which can be derived from talents, information, integrity, and deliberate investigation, on the one hand; and from secrecy and dispatch, on the other."²⁴

Alexander Hamilton wrote in opposition to including the House of Representatives:

"... The fluctuating, and taking its future increase into the account, the multitudinous composition of that body, forbid us to expect in it those qualities which are essential to the proper execution of such a trust. Accurate and comprehensive knowledge of foreign politics; a steady and systematic adherence to the same views; a nice and uniform sensibility to national character; decision, secrecy, and dispatch; are incompatible with the genius of a body so variable and so numerous. The very complication of the business, by introducing a necessity of the concurrence of so many different bodies, would of itself afford a solid objection. The greater frequency of the calls upon the house of representatives, and the greater length of time which it would often be necessary to keep them together when convened, to obtain their sanction in the progressive stages of a treaty, would be a source of so great inconvenience and expense, as alone ought to condemn the project."²⁵

Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, in an address before the Virginia legislature, said on the question of vesting the treaty-making power in the House of Representatives:

"Can secrecy be expected in sixty-five members? The idea is absurd. Besides, their sessions will probably last only two or three months in the year; therefore, on that account, they would be a very unfit body for negotiation whereas the Senate, from the smallness of its numbers, from the equality of power which each state has in it, from the length of time for which its members are elected, from the long sessions they may have without any great inconvenience to themselves or constituents, joined with the president, who is the federal head of the United States, form together a body in whom can be best and most safely vested the diplomatic power of the Union."²⁶

A few years later on November 19, 1794, the Jay Treaty between the United States and Great Britain was concluded, one of the first treaties to be negotiated and ratified under the new Constitution. President Washington wrote, in refusing to send the House of Representatives the instructions which had been given to the negotiators for the legislature's consideration of the treaty's effect on existing laws or requirements for implementing legislation:

"The nature of foreign negotiations requires caution, and their success must often depend on secrecy; ... The necessity of such caution and secrecy was one cogent reason for vesting the power of making treaties in the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, the principle on which that body was formed confining it to a small number of members."²⁷

Thus after the Constitution was adopted the chief reasons cited for confining the treaty-making power to the President and the Senate concentrated on advantages it was expected the Senate would have as a partner in the negotiations as a result of its smaller size: the ability to maintain secrecy, meet quickly, stay in session longer, and act efficiently. During the writing of the Constitution, the delegates also showed their concern for maintaining a system of checks and balances between the Executive and Legislative Branches and for forming a strong central government while still afford-

Footnotes at end of article.

ing the individual states protection of their rights and prerogatives.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Crandall, Samuel B. *Treaties, their making and enforcement*. Washington, Byrne & Co., 1916. pp. 24-42.

² Butler, Charles Henry. *The treaty-making power of the United States*. New York, Banks Law, 1902. p. 164.

³ Resolutions offered by Mr. Edmund Randolph, May 29, 1787. *Journal of U.S. Constitutional Convention of 1787*. Boston, Wait, 1819. p. 67.

⁴ Holt, W. Stull. *Treaties defeated by the Senate*. Gloucester, Mass., Peter Smith, 1964. p. 3.

⁵ Farrand, Max. *The framing of the Constitution of the United States*. New Haven, Yale, 1913. (1965 ed.) pp. 72 and 89.

⁶ *Journal of U.S. Constitutional Convention of 1787*. Boston, Wait, 1819. p. 77.

⁷ *U.S. Constitutional Convention, 1787. Notes of Debates in the Federal Convention of 1787* reported by James Madison. Athens, Ohio University Press, 1966. (Hereafter referred to as *Madison notes*.) p. 138.

⁸ *Madison notes*, p. 391.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 520.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 520.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 521.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 521.

¹⁴ *Madison's Notes*, p. 575.

¹⁵ *Madison's notes*, p. 600.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 602.

¹⁸ *Gov. Morris, Ibid.*, p. 602.

¹⁹ *Holt, op. cit.*, p. 11.

²⁰ Main, Jackson Turner. *The Antifederalists. Critics of the Constitution, 1781-1788*. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1961. p. 139.

²¹ *Journal*, pp. 422 and 445.

²² Elliot, Jonathan. *The Debates in the Several State Conventions on the adoption of the Federal Constitution as recommended by the General Convention at Philadelphia*. Philadelphia, Lippincott, 1836. p. 546.

²³ Crandall, *op. cit.*, p. 63.

²⁴ Hamilton, John C., ed. *The Federalist*. Philadelphia, Lippincott, 1866. Number LXXIV, March 7, 1788.

²⁵ *The Federalist, op. cit.*, No. LXXV. New York, March 28, 1788.

²⁶ *Elliott's Debates*. V. IV, p. 231.

²⁷ *Butler, op. cit.*, p. 292.

NEW CANAL: WHAT ABOUT BIOENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH?

(Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the longer I study the interoceanic canal problems the more I find new angles in it. The latest is a rising tide of criticism from scientists as regards the intermixing of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans by a canal at sea level and the use of nuclear explosives for excavation.

The latest statement in these regards is an article by Marti Mueller in the January 10, 1969, issue of *Science*, a weekly magazine published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

To make the indicated article available to the Congress, I quote it as part of remarks:

NEW CANAL: WHAT ABOUT BIOENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH?

(By Marti Mueller)

The protests of scientists concerned about U.S. plans to build a new interoceanic

Atlantic-Pacific sea-level canal seem, like television commercials, to grow louder and longer. These scientists claim that, unless thorough, extensive scientific studies are carried out before the oceans are linked, serious and irremediable ecological consequences may occur.

Since 1906 it has been recognized that eventually another canal would have to be built, as traffic through the Panama Canal increases. Some 1400 ships now plying the seas cannot pass through the existing canal because of draft and beam limitations. It is estimated that the canal will have reached capacity around 1985, with a flow of 19,000 ships a year. About 13,000 ships now pass through the canal each year.

After the outbreak of civil violence in Panama in 1964, President Johnson asked Congress to establish a five-member Canal Study Commission to lay the groundwork for a new canal project. Members of the commission are Robert Anderson (chairman), a diplomat; Robert Storey, a lawyer; Milton S. Eisenhower, a university president; Kenneth Fields, a former Army engineer; and Raymond Hill, a civilian engineer. The commission has an appropriation of \$24 million and has been assigned a final reporting date of 1 December 1970. The commission's task is, among other things, to recommend a location for a second canal, to study the scope of the anticipated negotiations with the country involved, to recommend an excavation technique, to assess costs and means of support, and to consider a defense system for the canal. Some critics say that, with a multitude of political, diplomatic, engineering, military, and financial problems facing the commission, the scientific considerations tend to get lost.

Scientists find two proposals for the canal particularly controversial: a proposal that the channel should be at sea level, thus intermixing the two oceans, and a proposal that atomic energy be used to dig it. They argue that consideration of either of these proposals should be preceded by extensive research into the possible environmental consequences. Scientists fear, for example, that linking the two oceans might result in serious changes in certain species of marine life, which may be genetically different in the Atlantic and the Pacific. They say that interbreeding may lead to sterilization of the offspring in some species. They wonder whether existing predator-prey relationships would be upset, with certain species becoming extinct and others overabundant. They worry lest temperature and water currents might be changed, and the balance of marine life thereby affected. They are also concerned about the sociological effects of the canal upon nearby tribal populations, which might be uprooted from their homes and means of livelihood. They warn that the use of atomic explosives to dig the canal may endanger plant and marine species, contaminate the food chain, and ultimately harm man.

Some scientists note that the only large-scale Canal Commission research program now under way is a Corps of Engineers study of feasible engineering methods. Environmental research pertaining to the canal is only modestly supported and is limited in scope. The Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) and the Smithsonian Institution are conducting research programs specifically designed to yield data on the canal. The commission also has asked the National Science Foundation and the Interior Department's Bureau of Fisheries to orient their own research programs, where possible, with canal studies.

The Smithsonian ecological research is self-supported. Initiated in 1967, it was funded at \$55,000 last year and at \$73,000 this year. The program focuses primarily on the possible biological consequences of linking the oceans with a saltwater channel, which would make possible the free move-

ment of all types of tropical ocean biota across the isthmus. The Smithsonian's Tropical Research Institute, near Balboa, in the Canal Zone, conducts studies of existing marine life and the ocean environment. Projects vary from a comparative study of the effects of temperature changes on the metabolism of tropical fish to an investigation of behavioral discrimination in Atlantic and Pacific shallow-water sea urchins. Only early results of this research are available—results such as the discovery that certain marine species can be crossbred.

The AEC's research program is supported by the Canal Commission. Begun in 1965, the 5-year, \$3-million research project has a more narrow focus than the Smithsonian research. The AEC is responsible for making radiological studies of the safety of nuclear excavation. These AEC bioenvironmental studies are contracted to Battelle Memorial Institute, which, in turn, subcontracts to universities, firms, and individuals. Projects include a study of human, agricultural, freshwater, and saltwater ecology, the construction of predictive models on fallout distribution patterns, and analyses of the transfer of radioactivity through the food chain. The Battelle Institute's programs are still largely in the data-collecting stages. One project which is well advanced, however, is an experimental program with radioactive nuclides. The institute has found nearly 300 nuclides unsafe for biological species.

Canal Commission executive director John Sheffey recently told *Science* that Commission members are in the process of negotiating ecological research proposals with Battelle Memorial Institute, which total \$250,000. Sheffey said he has had "very strong assurance" from Commission members who plan to meet next Monday that some of Battelle's projects will be approved. Battelle has primarily proposed completing identification of marine life specimens collected by Gilbert L. Voss, professor of marine sciences at the University of Miami, to learn more about marine life populations.

ADDITIONAL RESEARCH PROPOSED

Some scientists who argue that AEC and Smithsonian ecological research programs are inadequate want the federal government to sponsor a much more comprehensive, in-depth environmental study relating to the canal, which would run the cost into the millions figure, instead of thousands. Sidney Galler, Smithsonian assistant secretary for science, feels that such research would cost between \$25 and \$50 million over a period of 15 to 25 years and would involve numerous government and private institutions. (It is estimated that the chartering, operation, and data collection for one research ship for 1 year would cost about \$2.5 million. At least two ships, one on the Atlantic and one on the Pacific side, would be needed to conduct studies over a period of years.) Ecologists recommend that a survey and extensive studies be conducted of both the deep ocean and the continental shelf. The focus, they say, should be on food-chain studies, marine life, ocean currents, fish breeding, temperature differentials, wind conditions, and transplantation possibilities. The first phase of such a research program would be the gathering of fundamental data on biological, physical, and anthropological resources in the Pacific and Caribbean. This would be followed by comprehensive testing, by predictions, and possibly by a preventive program, based on systems analysis, mathematical modelings, and pilot testings. This research would be conducted during as well as before construction of the canal, and interim results would be made available for technical applications.

"With the exception of Battelle's work, there has not been a comprehensive research program with the object of ecological evaluation either proposed or supported by the

Commission," Smithsonian's Galler has said. His views are largely shared by Smithsonian scientists Ira Rubinoff, assistant director of marine biology, Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute; I. E. Wallen, director of the Office of Oceanography and Limnology; and David Challinor, deputy director of international activity. The Smithsonian scientists would like to see the federal government establish a national commission of environmental assessment, which would sponsor full scientific research on the possible ecological consequences of construction of the canal and propose prophylactic action where necessary.

In an article in *Science* (30 August) Ira Rubinoff suggested the creation of a multidisciplinary environmental control commission with broad powers to assess potential alterations in the environment. He has also suggested that a scientific advisory panel consisting of oceanographers, ecologists, and marine scientists be convened to discuss the scope of feasible pre-construction experimental research. Challinor recommends training scientists to assess the research needs. He says there is only a handful of scientists in the nation who have the expertise and the reputation to handle the canal-research data.

But the fanciful red brick towers of the Smithsonian are not the only place where comments flow. Richard Rosenblatt, an associate professor of marine biology at Scripps Oceanographic Institute, also feels that present knowledge and research are inadequate. One of his deepest concerns is a fear that the canal will place different morphological species in direct competition with each other, thereby disrupting the marine balance. Perhaps the most outspoken critic of the Canal Commission's proposal to build a sea-level channel is Lamont Cole, an ecologist at Cornell University. He objects to linking the oceans without long-term breeding experiments on what he believes may be genetically different marine populations; he warns that marine life is highly sensitive to even the most minute temperature differentials. On the question of atomic energy, Cole feels that present expertise is not sufficient to prevent dangerous radioactive isotopes from contaminating water and land and eventually upsetting the food chain. "I think this is the most irresponsible suggestion that I can remember since Admiral Byrd's senile proposal to blow ice caps off Antarctica," he says.

Ecologists will face numerous problems in their efforts to secure an intensive canal bioenvironmental research program. For one thing, an economy-minded Congress indicated last spring that it was not entirely sympathetic with the Canal Commission's financial problems. An extension of the commission's reporting date by a year and a half and an increase of \$6.5 million were granted only after considerable debate.

Another problem is that of possible conflicts of interest. The AEC, for example, is charged with promoting the peaceful uses of atomic energy, yet it is also responsible for insuring that safe radioactivity levels are maintained. Thus far there has been little interest shown by any agencies other than AEC and the Smithsonian in canal bioenvironmental research.

Not all of the problems relating to the canal are ecological. Another issue of interest to scientists is the question of the nuclear test ban treaty. If the U.S. Government decides to use atomic energy to build the canal, the present international nuclear test ban treaty, which prohibits nuclear explosions which would cause radioactivity to be present beyond a nation's territorial limits, would have to be changed. Some U.S. officials believe the U.S. could obtain Soviet consent if, in exchange, the U.S. would agree to allow the Russians to use atomic energy to build harbors in the Baltic. But this, of course, is speculation.

There are also vested political considerations involving the Canal Commission, evidenced by a comment from Canal Commission executive director Sheffey: "They [scientists] are interested in research, whereas we are interested in tactical problems." While political, engineering, and legal interests are represented on the five-member Canal Commission, there is no spokesman for scientific interests per se. Sheffey admits that some government officials take the view that "research is nice to have, but not very important," and he adds, "we can't be certain of the biological implications, until after the canal is built anyway—regardless of how much research is done now." Sheffey does not view the potential environmental consequences of a canal as particularly serious. "The possibilities of any serious disruptions to nature are very remote," he says, "and the potential threat to biota is so insignificant that it doesn't merit spending a lot of money on it." Sheffey also added, "it is obvious that Wallen and other Smithsonian scientists adopt the policy of taking an alarmist view to attract attention, and they tacitly admit it."

On the other hand, scientists feel that planning for the canal provides an opportunity to collect and analyze invaluable ecological data through extensive research. "I think its sole justification should be science. . . . This is a tremendously interesting once-in-5-million-years experiment," Wallen says. A lot of ecologists also seem to feel that the planning stages for the new canal provide a classic opportunity for scientists to do what they can to see that man does not manipulate his environment on a major scale without assessing the consequences.

RAISE INCOME TAX EXEMPTION

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have today sent letters to the President of the United States and chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee urging that the raising of personal tax exemptions be one of the primary goals to tax reform legislation. I would like to include the substance of my communications as part of my remarks:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 18, 1969.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Like most of my colleagues, I am pleased that it is your intention to send recommendations to Congress for major tax reform.

Wholesale revisions of the inequitable and unmerciful present tax structure are long overdue, and there is national support for a complete overhaul. I am particularly disturbed at disclosures of cases where individuals with enormously high incomes find ways to escape payment of taxes.

So long as such loopholes exist, the whole purpose of the income tax is perverted. It is past time to prohibit legal tricks that enable the wealthy to avoid tax payment.

Mr. President, tax reform is mandatory, but you and I know that major revisions will require months of preparation and hearings. Meanwhile the Administration could bring a measure of refreshing relief to the overtaxed public without an acute upset in the federal budget by recommending an immediate increase in the personal tax exemption from \$600 to \$750.

To this end I am writing to Chairman Mills of the House Ways and Means Commit-

tee in the hope that he will agree to the change and act as soon as possible on H.R. 2717, which I introduced for this purpose on January 9.

An increase in personal exemptions would provide blanket easing of tax burdens while the overall reform program is in process. The \$750 figure can be raised at a later date if determined to be feasible. I am also hoping that more consideration will be given to the single individual in the tax reform program. As you are aware, the current law discriminates against the single person both in application of tax rates and in personal exemptions. Single persons with families to support are especially imposed upon under the provision which deprives them of the joint-return clause available to married couples.

I am confident that your recommendations will initiate a much-needed change in our tax laws. Meanwhile your support of H.R. 2717 will be deeply appreciated.

With every good wish,

Sincerely,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 18, 1969.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, House Ways and Means Committee,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: while awaiting White House recommendations for major tax revisions, I feel that Congress should act quickly to raise personal income tax exemptions. Some of our colleagues have already introduced bills that would double the present \$600, but it is my belief that the figure is unrealistic at this time.

On January 9th, I introduced H.R. 2717, which is now before your committee, to increase from \$600 to \$750 the personal income tax exemption. Enactment would bring a measure of refreshing relief to the overtaxed public without an acute upset in the federal budget, and the figure could be raised at a later date if determined to be feasible.

I shall appreciate your immediate consideration of this legislation.

With every good wish,

Sincerely,

JOHN D. SAYLOR,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO SUPPORTS ELECTORAL REFORM

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I have joined in sponsoring House Joint Resolution 317 because I agree that it is time—indeed past time—to remedy the defects of our anomalous electoral college system.

We have had warnings aplenty that our method of electing the President and Vice President brings the Nation unnecessarily close to the brink of crisis every 4 years—and we do not have to dig into the pages of history for examples. Two out of the three presidential elections in this decade alone have raised the specter of disaster: in 1960 the total popular vote was very close, within two-tenths of 1 percent, making very real the possibility of a minority President; and in 1968 the strong third-party candidacy of George Wallace meant that a different outcome in just one State, California, would have denied an electoral majority to President Nixon, and the election

would have been thrown into the House for decision.

The electoral college system does not fulfill today the function originally envisioned for it; much less does it meet the needs of our complex urban society. I can see very little reason and no excuse for delaying action any longer on this matter.

The measure I am cosponsoring, the same one introduced in the Senate by BIRCH BAYH, of Indiana, calls for direct election of the President and Vice President. Our proposed amendment makes it clear that a presidential ticket would consist of a specific candidate for each of the two positions, to eliminate the possibility of unwise or hasty amalgams crossing party lines. The electors would be the people themselves, each casting a ballot to vote for the ticket of their choice. Eliminated would be the presidential electors who now, by inserting themselves between the people and the final election decision, interfere with the operation of direct democracy.

The presidential ticket receiving the most votes would, very simply, be elected. Gone would be the brokerage system of dispensing electoral votes, whereby a ticket which has narrowly won the popular vote in a given State may add all that State's electoral votes to its column. Gone would be the problem of the "faithless elector" who decides to vote "his conscience" rather than follow the dictates of those who elected him. Gone would be the possibility of a presidential ticket "elected" by a minority of the people.

Should none of the candidates succeed in winning at least 40 percent of the popular vote, our amendment provides that a runoff election would be held between the two tickets with the greatest numbers of votes. Congress is directed to determine the time of such a special election, and the intent is, of course, that it should be held as soon as practicable. Eliminated would be the possibility of a long interregnum between presidential administrations while the Congress wrestled with the dilemma of who was to become the next President.

It is my own feeling, and one shared by many of my colleagues, I know, that merely tinkering with our present electoral system is not enough. Amending the Constitution is a fairly complicated process; halfway measures are not good enough. The major fault of the proportional and district plans is that they do not guarantee that the people's choice will become the Nation's President. And nothing less is appropriate or desirable for a country such as ours, whose very foundations are laid on the basic principles of democratic government.

Testifying before the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments in 1967, Dr. Joseph Kallenbach, a noted political scientist, said:

The elector system has been allowed more or less by default to continue to exist as an operating part of the presidential selection machinery. It has persisted to this day, not because it represents in any important sense the wisdom of the Framers, but because it has turned into a device, awkward though it is, for registering the will of the voters on who, among the final contestants, shall become President. It has saved the nation from no disasters. It constitutes the vestigial re-

main of a theory of government and of the Presidency that has long since gone out of fashion. It should be eliminated.

I could not agree more. With the near-miss of the 1968 election still clear in our minds, we should take action now to rationalize our electoral process. The election of the President of the United States is too important to be left to the laws of chance. The people, and only the people, should determine who is to govern them every 4 years. Let us give them that opportunity—by amending the Constitution to provide for direct election of the President and Vice President.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO URGES REVISION OF IMMIGRATION LABOR RESTRICTIONS

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of H.R. 3239 which would amend the Immigration and Nationality Act so that section 212 will operate as it did before the 1965 amendments. An alien seeking to enter the United States to perform skilled or unskilled labor under section 212, must now prove that his addition to the labor force will not glut the market and depress wages. Such burden of proof, with the expense and delay to the immigrant even if he does satisfy it, is unjustified. The burden excludes deserving immigrants from coming to our Nation which was originally built by immigrants' labor.

In response to the plight of such would-be immigrants who ask only for the opportunity to contribute their energy and talents to America's industrial might, I introduced H.R. 3239 at the outset of this Congress. At the same time the bill relieves the immigration applicant of the unreasonable burden of proof, it insures the same present protection against an inflated labor supply. H.R. 3239 provides that protection by allowing admittance under labor preference only if the Secretary of Labor does not make the affirmative finding that a market does not exist in the United States for the applicant's particular skill. Under H.R. 3239, as under present law, no alien would be admitted if his addition to the labor force might tend to adversely affect wages or other working conditions. But the burden of proof would be shifted from the alien, who now has to prove that demand for his services exists, over to the Government which, to deny admission, would have to prove that demand does not exist.

The Department of Labor announces that the unemployment rate is the lowest in decades. I see no reason then, why we should presume that the labor applicant's admission will crowd the market. Surely we can assume that our markets can absorb a labor source which is so small a part of the total supply. Yet, because now the alien must prove that a market for his labor exists, section 212 presently is based on the opposite assumption.

Countries which depend most heavily on labor preference for immigration, rather than, for example, preference for

U.S. relatives, are at an unfair disadvantage. Statistics for immigration during 1968 when compared with those for 1965 illustrate that disadvantage. Until the end of 1965, "labor clearance" was granted as my bill would provide, for example—the labor preference applicant automatically secured clearance unless the Secretary of Labor specifically found that his employment in this country might add to a surplus of his particular skill. During that year, the last in which, as just stated, the burden of proof for labor clearance, lay with the Secretary, and not the alien, 5,400 Irishmen immigrated to this country. During 1968, the Irish immigration rate was 3,600, or in other words, almost 33 percent below the rate for 1965. The 1968 figures show that German immigration has decreased from the 1965 rate by almost the same percentage. I cite the German and Irish figures because they represent countries which rely heavily on the labor preference, as opposed to the preference for relatives of U.S. citizens.

This amendment is the same that I introduced in the 89th and 90th Congresses. I say now, as then:

Our country's greatness has been built on the contribution of its immigrants. Continued reduction of labor immigrants can only result in restricting the growth and prosperity of our Nation. The provision of the old law which I ask to be reinstated has survived the test of time—it has worked and worked well—and only by returning to it can we further strengthen our new immigration law.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO URGES CORRECTION OF INEQUITIES IN 1965 IMMIGRATION AMENDMENTS

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on January 14 of this year I introduced H.R. 3238, a bill designed to correct certain unforeseen inequities resulting from the 1965 amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act, which went into full effect in July of last year. My bill has been referred to the Judiciary Committee, and I am hopeful that prompt action will be taken on it, as the problems to which it addresses itself are immediate and pressing.

As you know, the basic purpose of the 1965 immigration amendments was to eliminate the 40-year-old national origins quota system, whereby the quota from each country was determined by a formula based on the origins of the U.S. population at the time of the 1920 census. Under this system, Great Britain's annual quota was 65,361, and Italy's was 5,666, a situation as irrelevant to the facts as it was discriminatory. In 1964, almost 35,000 of Great Britain's allowed quota was unused, while Italy had an oversubscribed quota—a waiting list—of nearly 250,000.

The temporary immigration pool created by the 1965 amendments during the 2½-year transition period between October 1965 and July 1968 did much to alleviate the accumulated backlog,

though Italy still has a substantial waiting list. This pooling permitted the unused quotas from the prior year to be used by countries with oversubscribed quotas. The result, to give an example, was that Italian immigration—including immediate relatives not subject to the quota limitation—rose from 9,986 in fiscal year 1965 to 25,994, in fiscal 1967.

On July 1, 1968, the national origins quota system, along with the transitional pooling of unused numbers, was abolished and replaced by a seven-point preference category system, with a certain percentage restriction assigned to each category. In general, the system places priority on reuniting families and attracting professional talent and needed skilled labor into this country. The preference system operates on a first-come first-served basis, regardless of nationality, within the overall limitation of 170,000 from non-Western Hemisphere countries, and a limit of 20,000 per country.

While eliminating the inequities of the national-origins quota system, this new one creates problems of its own, as many of us have become aware. For one thing, national quota oversubscription has been replaced by a different kind of oversubscription, whereby visa numbers are not available in some countries for the lower preference categories because the 20,000 national limit has been reached in the highest categories. As an example, the category of brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens ranks fifth in order of preference. Italy in 1965 had a backlog of approximately 100,000 applicants in this category, and the increase in Italy's national quota to 20,000 has done little to decrease this backlog, because most of the visas have been going to the four higher preference categories: unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens; spouses and unmarried children of aliens admitted to the United States for permanent residence; members of the professions and scientists and artists of exceptional ability; and married children of U.S. citizens.

It is my belief, embodied in the legislation I have introduced, that the oversubscription problems created by the preference category system can be largely alleviated by pooling, the same method used to absorb backlogs in the transition period before total abolishment of the national-origins quota system. My bill would authorize transferral of all visa numbers not issued or otherwise used to an immigration pool for reallocation during the following year. Up to 25 percent of these numbers could be reallocated by the President during fiscal years 1969 and 1970 by proclamation, within certain limitations, to—in the language of the bill—"avoid undue hardship resulting from the reduction in the number of immigrants who may be admitted to the United States caused by the operation of the Act of October 3, 1965." The remainder of the visa numbers in the pool would be available to immigrants who would be admissible except for the oversubscription of visa numbers on a national basis. These visas would be allocated from the immigration pool within the percentage limitations and in the

order of priority specified in the 1965 amendments.

Section 2 of H.R. 3238 addresses itself to a second problem inadvertently raised by the 1965 amendments, the brain drain and, most specifically the brain drain from underdeveloped countries and other countries which had had low quotas under the old national origins quota system and are now first in line to send us their most talented. As I noted before, third preference is given to members of the professions and others with exceptional skills and education. I would limit the total number of visas available under this category on a national level, not to exceed 1,700 from a single foreign state a year.

The need for the measures proposed in this legislation may be only temporary. We are still in the transitional phase, and it is difficult to tell how well the 1965 system will work. In the meantime, I believe that the reforms I have proposed are of utmost importance at this time, and I urge the early enactment of this legislation.

HUD ASKED TO INVESTIGATE INSURANCE ABUSES

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, I called to the attention of my colleagues in the House an unfortunate situation which exists in ghetto areas throughout America. In my speech, I called for hearings to investigate the charges that the so-called FAIR plans insurance program adopted by the 90th Congress has proven to be a bonanza for insurance companies.

As many of my colleagues who represent ghetto areas throughout the Nation know, since the establishment of the urban insurance program last year, insurance rates have tripled, quadrupled, and in thousands of cases, insurance policies have been canceled outright.

Today I have written to the Honorable George Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, calling to his attention this serious problem that exists in our Nation. My letter to Secretary Romney follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 18, 1969.
HON. GEORGE ROMNEY,
Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban
Development, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On February 5 I made a speech on the Floor of the House calling to the attention of the Congress a serious situation with reference to insurance that exists in every ghetto in America.

As you know, in the 90th Congress, the Congress passed legislation providing for the FAIR plans insurance program. Since the passage of this legislation, I have received complaints from small businessmen that their insurance rates have tripled and quadrupled, and in many, many instances, their insurance policies have been cancelled outright. The charge has been made that the Congress has provided a bonanza for insurance companies and is not alleviating the plight of small businessmen.

I am enclosing for your information a copy of my speech, articles from the *Chicago Daily*

News, and letters from retail associations regarding this problem.

It is my understanding that representatives of HUD are conducting an investigation of these charges and are working closely with the Director of Insurance in the State of Illinois.

I would like to be kept informed of the progress of this investigation, and may I hasten to add, if this investigation does not prove satisfactory, then I plan personally to hold hearings on my own in the City of Chicago in the Federal Building.

I do hope that HUD can correct this situation so that it will not be necessary for me to hold hearings. I await your early reply.

With every best wish, I am

Sincerely,

FRANK ANNUNZIO,
Member of Congress.

I am also including at this point in the Record an article from the *Chicago Daily News* and letters from retail associations regarding this insurance problem:

[From the *Chicago (Ill.) Daily News*,
Feb. 7, 1969]

STATE, U.S. PROBE GHETTO INSURANCE
RATES HERE

(By William Clements)

Illinois and federal officials met Friday to study complaints that fire insurance rates in Chicago's ghetto have gone beyond the reach of the average property owner.

James Baylor, state insurance director, planned to discuss the issue with James H. Hunt, of the federal insurance administration.

Baylor also was scheduled to meet with officials of the Illinois Insurance Placement Facility which operates the so-called FAIR plan.

The facility oversees the inspection and rating of ghetto property, and has a direct hand in determining how high the fire insurance rates will go.

The *Daily News* disclosed last Saturday that rates under the FAIR plan have doubled and even tripled, forcing some small businessmen to complain that the increase could force them out of the city.

Baylor has conceded that the rates in some cases are high, but in general he didn't feel they were out of line.

Insurance companies have been reluctant in recent years to write fire coverage in ghetto areas that may be involved in rioting.

The companies have said that increased premium costs couldn't come near matching potential property loss due to rioting.

Because of this vacuum, last May Congress passed the Urban Insurance Act, designed to provide "fair access to everybody" who wanted fire insurance coverage.

The Illinois FAIR plan, passed last July by the General Assembly, is patterned after the federal statute.

The reports of soaring premiums costs have prompted legislators in Springfield and in Washington to call for an investigation.

U.S. Rep. Frank Annunzio (D-Ill.) has called for a special subcommittee investigation on the congressional level.

Annunzio, a Chicago Democrat, has said the federal act never was intended to have rates jump so high. He helped write the federal statute.

Annunzio said the rising rates are a "cruel hoax."

Rep. Anthony J. Scariano (D-Park Forest) has asked the General Assembly to look into the matter. He said the problem of continually increasing insurance costs in the innercity is becoming "a racket."

Baylor also has dispatched two investigators to Chicago to study the rate structure of premium costs in the ghetto.

Baylor is scheduled to meet with top Democratic legislators in Springfield next Tues-

day to report on results of his staff investigation.

SPINDEL INSURANCE AGENCY, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., February 7, 1969.
Representative FRANK ANNUNZIO,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE ANNUNZIO: Enclosed herewith is a copy of a letter sent to the following Congressmen, which may be of interest to you: Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Senator CHARLES H. PERCY, Representative ABNER J. MIKVA.

Very truly yours,
MANFRED S. SPINDEL,
President.

SPINDEL INSURANCE AGENCY, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., February 7, 1969.
Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SENATOR DIRKSEN: The writer has been an agent/broker in the insurance business for the past twenty seven years. For the past several years, a condition has existed which has become increasingly intolerable. The reasons are as follows:

1. The Fire and Casualty insurance companies have actually (not admittedly) gone out of the Risk business. They are basically investment companies.

2. They have discriminated, and are still discriminating, in the acceptance of risks on the basis of race, color and creed. This is a known fact throughout this nation by every insurance agent and broker operating in any community of any size.

3. The program, which was established in the latter part of 1963, supposedly to provide Fire insurance in the ghetto areas, is failing miserably. The Fire and Casualty insurance companies are cancelling and restricting their writings not only in the ghetto areas, but most of the areas within the city limits of a metropolitan area. These same Fire insurance companies are restricting their writings of protection on private dwellings in suburban areas on the basis that their exposure is too great. One of the companies we represent has told us not to submit any risks on a private dwelling in excess of \$45,000.

4. The Placement Facility here in Illinois is being misused by the companies, due to the fact, in my opinion, that their acquisition cost, if placed through the Placement Facility, is only 8%, whereas we formerly received a commission of 35% on residential property. Commercial property paid a lesser commission.

5. Most all of the stock companies have reduced the commissions of the independent insurance agents, with the result that the independent agent is being driven out of business. This will result in just a few giant agencies being left to do business in United States.

6. The constant mergers of Fire and Casualty companies have and are reducing the insurance market to a point where, if this practice continues, a virtual monopoly will exist in the Insurance Fire and Casualty field.

The writer feels that an apparent lack of interest on the part of our representatives, both national and state, has created this intolerable situation.

Unfortunately, the buying public has not made itself articulate enough by letter as yet, but I can state unequivocally that the resentment of this situation is reaching a boiling point, not only within the negro community, which you and your fellow elected representatives will have to face eventually.

In view of the above statements, I regret that my agency is planning on leaving the Fire and Casualty insurance field, since we can no longer serve our clientele effectively or conscientiously.

Very truly yours,
MANFRED S. SPINDEL,
President.

ILLINOIS LIQUOR STORES
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Chicago, February 12, 1969.

Representative FRANK ANNUNZIO,
Longworth Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am in receipt of your timely letter dated February 6, 1969, and am aware of your comments on the floor of the House regarding the basic property insurance program in Illinois. I was reluctant to issue a progress report until the Illinois Placement Facility actually issued policies and quoted rates.

From the inception of the Facility's activities, the first problem was a delay between application by the businessman and inspection of the property by the Facility. The Facility claimed that the backlog was holding up inspections. The next problem concerned the inspection report itself, which failed to specify wherein the property was defective. This prevented the property owner from making the appropriate corrections in order to obtain insurance. The third problem which we have just encountered is the ridiculously high rates which are being charged the inter-city property owners and businessmen.

The discrepancy in insurance rates for similar properties in similar locations is alarming. We have evidence in one case where the rate was figured on the basis of \$26.00 per \$1,000.00 of coverage, while an adjacent similar building was figured at \$16.00 per \$1,000.00 of coverage. No material difference exists between the conditions of the two properties. As attorney for the business community, we have a committee meeting with Mr. Baylor, the new director of insurance from the State of Illinois. He has promised to look into the problems and take an active interest in the conduct of the Facility.

I have also recommended that the business community form a citizens' group to work with the department of insurance as well as the Illinois Placement Facility.

Thank you for your continued assistance.
Yours very truly,

MORTON SIEGEL,
General Counsel.

It is my fervent hope that the administration and our new Secretary of Housing and Urban Development will take speedy action to investigate these very serious charges and to inform the Congress of the remedial measures they have taken to correct the abuses prevalent in the FAIR plans insurance program.

FEDERAL PRIVACY ACT

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation in the House of Representatives calling for the enactment of a Federal Privacy Act. My proposal is designed to protect the individual citizen from unauthorized disclosure or use of personal information collected by various Federal agencies.

We have seen both the Congress and the prior administration take certain limited steps to protect privacy. The Freedom of Information Act is essentially oriented toward the needs of the press and other communications media. In addition, Federal departments have been forced by investigations of congressional committees to modify their methods of securing information.

Yet I find a glaring disregard for the rights of individuals who, in most instances, are not even aware that ex-

tremely detailed and personal information is being collected and maintained in various agency files.

There are presently some 20 Federal agencies collecting information about individuals. The Defense Department maintains some 14 million records; Social Security, 160 million files on persons living and dead; Civil Service Commission, 8 million records, of which an estimated 250,000 contain adverse information; and the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which reputedly has files on 1 million people.

All kinds of information is included: academic achievement, health, court cases, credit standing, census data, police records, birth and marriage, employment history, loyalty-security clearances, military service records, tax returns.

A 1966 article in the Nation suggested that much of the data is of bad quality, "acquired by governmental employees of poor judgment" or by various private sources, and not "by skilled investigators." The combination of fact, opinion and rumor may create a false picture. Even the most complicated computer is no better than its program, and no programmer can ever organize all the nuances of human existence.

Senator Edward V. Long, in his 1967 book, "The Intruders," stated:

Never before in our history have such quantities of personal data been collected by so many different groups, about so many people.

Yet, Supreme Court Justice Brandeis spoke of privacy as—the right to be left alone—the most comprehensive of rights, and the right most valued by civilized men.

This continual information gathering at all levels of government presents us with an Orwellian threat. The ordinary citizen simply has no knowledge of the amount, nor of the accuracy of the information being filed about him.

On February 4, I joined with the Honorable CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI in cosponsoring the Fair Credit Reporting Act. As an amendment to the Truth in Lending Act, this legislation extends consumer protection to the area of credit information and is designed to prevent possible mishandling or misuse of credit information being garnered by private concerns.

The bill I introduce today represents additional and even more needed protection for the individual and will provide the ordinary citizen with a safeguard against abuses to his rights of privacy.

The provisions of the Federal Privacy Act require each agency maintaining such records to notify the individual that the information is on file. The agency is enjoined from unauthorized disclosure of the file except with permission of the individual. A written record must be kept showing the names of all those who inspect the record.

As necessary safeguards, exemptions are made in cases involving national security. The identity of a person furnishing information contained in any record will not be disclosed.

The individual is permitted to examine his own record and have copies made at his own expense. He is also allowed to supplement his file with infor-

mation he deems pertinent for the record. This will allow him the right to rebut any false or incomplete information which might, under ordinary circumstances, be used against him without his full knowledge.

Generally, an individual does not really know who has the information about him, or what is in the file, or how many agencies are using it, or for what purposes. He has no mechanisms for explanations, or to add mitigating circumstances.

This bill is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to insert the text of the Federal Privacy Act in the RECORD.

H.R. 7214

A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that individuals be apprised of records concerning them which are maintained by Government agencies

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately after section 552 thereof the following new section:

"§ 552a. Individual records

"(a) Each agency which shall maintain records concerning any individual which are indexed according to the individual's name and which contain any information obtained from any source other than such individual shall, with respect to such records—

"(1) notify said individual by mail at his last known address that the agency maintains or is about to maintain a record concerning said individual;

"(2) refrain from disclosing the record or any information contained therein to any person, except with permission of the individual concerned or, in the event said individual cannot be located or communicated with after reasonable effort, with permission from members of the individual's family or guardian after a showing of good cause for such information; or in the event that disclosure of said record is required under section 552 of this chapter or by any other provision of law;

"(3) notify each individual by mail at his last known address of all transfers of information concerning such individual to any other agency;

"(4) maintain an accurate record of the names of all persons inspecting such records;

"(5) permit any individual to inspect his own record and have copies thereof made at his expense; and

"(6) permit an individual to supplement the information contained in his record with any information such individual deems pertinent to his record.

"(b) This section may be enforced in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (3) of subsection (a) of section 552 of this chapter.

"(c) Each agency may establish published rules stating the time, place, fees to the extent authorized, and procedure to be followed with respect to making records promptly available to an individual, and to otherwise implement the provisions of this section.

"(d) This section shall not apply to records that are—

"(1) specifically required by Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of the national security;

"(2) investigative files compiled for law enforcement purposes, except to the extent that such records have been maintained for a longer period than reasonably necessary to commence prosecution or other action or to the extent available by law to a party other than an agency; and

"(3) inter- or intra-agency memorandums or letters which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency.

"(e) This section shall not be held or considered to permit the disclosure of the name of any person who has furnished information contained in any record subject to this section.

"(f) If any provision of this section or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this section and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

(b) The table of sections of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting—

"552a. Individual records."

immediately below—

"552. Public information; agency rules; opinions, orders, records, and proceedings."

Sec. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall become effective on the ninetieth day following the date of enactment of this Act.

FAIRER TAXATION

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, there is public demand for tax reform and for the establishment of a more equitable foundation of tax procedures. The public is much aware of the importance of the hearings being conducted by the House Ways and Means Committee toward these worthy objectives.

Personally, I have had considerable favorable response to my bill, H.R. 6254 which would require the payment of a minimum Federal income tax by individuals and corporations, some of whom in the upper brackets of earnings have found ways and means to remain within the law and yet avoid tax payments. This of course is eminently unfair to the average wage earner.

There is growing support for this legislation and I include here editorials which recently have appeared in the Meriden, Conn., Journal, the Naugatuck, Conn., News and the Waterbury, Conn., American urging adoption of remedial legislation of this type.

[From the Meriden (Conn.) Journal, Feb. 13, 1969]

MONAGAN TAX EQUITY BILL

In 1967 there were 155 taxpayers in the nation who paid no federal income taxes although, their returns showed, they earned more than \$200,000. Twenty-one of them reported earnings of more than \$1 million without having to pay a dime in federal taxes. Countless others with incomes of more than \$20,000 escape federal taxation, and it's all legal because of loopholes in the tax laws and regulations.

So what? Well, for one thing, every person who exempts himself from paying federal income taxes makes it necessary for the rest of us to take up the slack. The inequity of the situation is too obvious to belabor.

Connecticut Fifth District U.S. Rep. John S. Monagan is one who finds the unfairness of it all distasteful. He has filed a bill in Congress that will require individuals and corporations that earn over \$20,000 a year to pay a minimum federal tax, loopholes or not.

Rep. Monagan told the House of Representatives: "This unjust and wasteful system of collecting federal revenues must be reformed or the country and the Congress

may well face what former Secretary of the Treasury has called a taxpayer revolt. This rebellion will come not from the poor but from the tens of millions of middle-class families... with incomes of \$7,000 to \$20,000... and who pay over half of our individual income taxes."

He doesn't feel that requiring those with high incomes to pay a minimum federal tax is discriminatory. Rather, their tax obligations would be brought more into line with those of the majority of taxpayers with medium incomes.

The premise that everyone who is able to do so should share in the cost of running the country is unassailable. Rep. Monagan's bill may be what we need to distribute tax liability more equitably.

[From the Naugatuck (Conn.) News, February 1969]

NEED FOR TAX REFORM

Anyone with even a smattering of modern American history knows that talk of tax reform has been a staple diet for members of the Congress of the United States for untold generations.

Someone is always talking about tax reform, but nobody really does very much about it.

Going back a couple of generations at least, there was the famous FDR credo of "tax and tax and spend and spend and elect and elect" which, as a matter of fact, worked out rather well for the Democratic Party.

That was supposed to be tax reform that "soaked the rich" and took much of the burden off the shoulders of the "little guy—the working stiff."

Well, has it?

It certainly has not, if we can accept the figures offered yesterday by our own Rep. John S. Monagan.

For Mr. Monagan, introducing a new bill into the congressional hopper, offered some rather interesting statistics to back up his current legislative demand for a tax reform.

Mr. Monagan said that middle class families and individuals (whose annual incomes range between \$7,000 and \$20,000) account for more than one-half of the individual income taxes paid in the nation.

Yet, at the same time, the records show that in 1967 there were 155 cases in which income tax returns were filed with adjusted gross incomes of over \$200,000—and not one single penny of income tax was paid. All quite legal, of course!

Mr. Monagan's bill would put a curb on this sort of thing. It would require a minimum income tax for individuals and corporations such as the 155 "exceptional cases" mentioned above.

We heartily approve, with one exception. What we should be concerned about, in cases like this, is not the minimum but the maximum.

This is, at any rate, a step in the proper direction. But what is really needed, and we are sure that Mr. Monagan knows this as well as we do, is not another piecemeal attempt to straighten out some obvious inequities, but a determined and conscientious legislative effort to rewrite and rebuild the entire federal tax structure.

[From the Waterbury (Conn.) American, Feb. 10, 1969]

MONAGAN'S TAX REFORM BILL

U.S. Rep. John S. Monagan's bill on federal tax reforms was filed in Washington this week at a time when the nation was becoming more conscious about evils of the present system. Considerable publicity has been given to the loopholes which enable millionaires to get away without paying much income tax and to the large number of persons in high income brackets who don't have to pay any income tax at all.

Congressman Monagan's bill, which de-

serves widespread consideration, is aimed at correcting abuses which result from the present system, and to strengthen the country's resources. He told the House of Representatives that there is no question on the need of tax reform, only on the path it should take. His bill spells out some very specific ways to make individual's income tax payments conform with their ability to pay.

The legislator from Waterbury feels a minimum federal income tax should be imposed on individuals and corporations with substantial income, regardless of the exemptions and deductions which would normally reduce their tax liability to nothing.

He pointed specifically to 155 tax returns in 1967, with adjusted gross incomes above \$200,000, on which no federal income taxes were due. Twenty-one of these returns listed incomes of over a million dollars. Little wonder that Rep. Monagan and other legislators are beginning to fear a taxpayers' revolt!

Rep. Monagan's bill would not only restore a degree of greater fairness in the system, but it would help produce additional revenue to finance the nation's needed programs.

Persons with small incomes are not necessarily suffering under the present system, which appears to hit most heavily at those with medium incomes. There are plenty of loopholes in the Internal Revenue Service's regulations to aid the very wealthy in saving on taxes, but there are very few which are applicable to middle-income people. When the people with very high incomes pay at least as much tax as those with medium or small incomes, the federal tax system will be approaching the type of fairness that is expected under an equitable tax program.

SHOWDOWN OR COUNTDOWN?

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, a new approach to the difficult, frustrating national problems facing the 91st Congress has been proposed by one of America's leading public relations men, George Hammond, chairman of the board of Carl Byoir & Associates, and president of the Public Relations Society of America for 1969. Mr. Hammond is one of my distinguished constituents and for many years has resided in West Redding, Conn., which is located in the Fifth Congressional District.

Mr. Hammond directs our attention to "the gleaming launch pads of Cape Kennedy for a new symbol and a new method of solving the Nation's large and complex problems," such as the urban crisis, pollution, transportation, and education.

The symbol is the countdown. The method is the space program's approach to the tremendous, complex mission of landing an American on the moon within 8 years.

Mr. Hammond suggests, Mr. Speaker, that the space program has given us a lesson many of us have missed:

This country can attain a goal frankly conceded at its inception as unrealistic at best and impossible at worst by deliberate planning, massive organization, and a systematic commitment of the necessary human and material resources.

He points out that "the space effort is an astonishingly successful blend of

Government, industry, universities, science, money and people"—a combination of effort by many segments of our society such as will be necessary to solve our pressing domestic problems.

Mr. Hammond's views on this subject were given fully in a speech which he gave when he was installed as president of Public Relations Society of America. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and I urge them to give particular attention to his recommendations on tax reform.

I would like to begin with a story that I'm sure has a familiar ring to many of you here. A company president recently asked that I join him in his board room at 9 a.m. the following day. I knew he was in trouble. He knew it.

The next day about a dozen of us—executives, lawyers and public relations people—sat around a gleaming oval table. I'll never forget the president's first words:

"Now let's not start by bringing everybody up to date."

He didn't want a rehash of where we stood. He wanted us to think our way out of a crisis. He wanted a plan that would work. He had confidence we could come up with one. And he had faith we could make our plan work.

As it turned out, he was right on all counts. I cite this incident because it probably sums up the mood of the distinguished men who are participating in our outstanding program this year.

They know the fix this country is in today. Each knows his share of the problems only too well. I'm sure they don't mind organizing the facts for one more audience; they know we all must start with the facts. But I'll bet they harbor a secret hope that this time their listeners will really do something—and something effective.

John Gardner, one of my great enthusiasts, who will address us tomorrow, made the point clearly and well when he said recently:

"We have a plentiful supply of Americans who are apprehensive or angry over our problems, plenty who shout about them or weave ideological spells over them, plenty who make political capital out of them. But we need more recruits for what I call the 'army without banners,' those who are quietly seeking solutions."

We would not be here today if we did not believe that we can find solutions. That's how we make our living—by helping a wide variety of organizations tackle the crises as they arise.

We know, for the most part, what the organizations we serve must do to meet their goals in the face of irate shareholders, headline-hunting politicians, and professors quick with criticism but slow to shoulder responsibility.

There was a time—and not long ago too—when we could clearly identify the public interest and then work for a sensible accommodation with the private interest.

Today, however, the public interest is not as sharply defined. As a result, each contending group maintains that it alone has the rightful mandate to represent the public interest.

Thus, as the conflicts mount in number and intensity, the zealots stride toward the inevitable showdown: "High Noon" all over again.

As we face a typical public problem today, each of us is likely to see himself as the desperate and tired-eyed Gary Cooper.

In other words, we are terrorized by the bad guys, we often find ourselves unsupported by the good guys, and, in the end, sustained only by the hope that, as in "High Noon," the last bullet—or ballot—will be fired for our side and thereupon save us.

A last-ditch showdown can only relieve

incidental crises. It cannot remove the underlying conditions that will bring on more emergencies later.

Also, the showdown today, as a century ago, may leave bodies in the dust and, with the bloodshed, the ultimate triumph of stubbornness and stupidity.

It is a senseless and outmoded way of handling a public problem.

Many today fear our system is heading for a colossal breakdown. Others are feeding this fear with fire-breathing handbills and plays, paralyzing sit-ins, and whatever else they can devise to create and sustain harassment and outrage.

And why? They say that what we have is bad and that they can no longer tolerate the system in its present form.

But my memory for hobgoblins is pretty good.

I remember that 30 years ago Alvin Hansen, then a leading economist, said:

"We are confronted with an economy with no large, rich areas to be occupied anywhere in the world and with a particularly stationary population in the industrial countries."

Obviously, with the frontier closed, he could only conclude that America's economic future looked pretty bleak.

I recall making quite a stir at about that time with a three-day seminar that I organized at the University of Rochester that deliberately took as its theme, "New Frontiers in American Life."

The idea for the seminar came from one of our corporate clients who was convinced that America did have a future, and a highly promising one at that.

So much for hobgoblins.

We now have a proposition before us. It goes like this:

Forces are converging on our society that do threaten to substitute chaos for the millions of interrelated inputs and outputs that make our system work.

What should you and I do about it? What can we do?

Do we have a useful sense of how people feel, think and act? Do we have a reasoning process; a voice that will be listened to, and a grasp of leadership?

Do we have the range of talents required to make wisdom heard, and to give intelligence and good will a continuing opportunity to improve our lives?

Much of the despair we hear today centers on the belief that things were never this bad and that our national experience is of little or no help in meeting the new crises.

I disagree. Let me tell you why.

In doing so I ask that you consider three specific concepts and their implications for us.

The first is embodied in the Constitution and in the unique accomplishment of the Federalists—Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay—in achieving its ratification by the original thirteen states.

In a country desolated by war, bankrupt, and with dim international prospects, its leaders—some quite young—shouldered the task of finding answers to unprecedented problems.

They did not flinch. They argued through a hot summer and came up with answers which they incorporated in a new idea for self-government: a national government, but with local autonomy.

But it was just that—an idea. They could not be sure it would work.

What's more, they could not be sure it would even be adopted by the states.

In fact, historians report that a majority of the citizens would have voted against the Constitution had there been a popular referendum that autumn. And here is where Hamilton, Madison and Jay performed a political and public relations miracle.

They sold the merits of the new Constitution one at a time with arguments that were

understandable and believable—in 85 essays which became the *Federalist* papers.

Then they launched a dramatic, thoroughly modern campaign of personal appeals to the influential local leaders, focused on mass persuasion. One by one the states were won over. And this is how the United States of America got started on its remarkable course.

Dr. Allan Nevins, one of America's leading historians, said in his PRSA Foundation lecture six years ago in Boston, that, and I quote:

"Their success constitutes the greatest work ever done in America in the field of public relations." The labors of Hamilton, Madison and Jay, he concluded, "may well be studied by all workers engaged in the varied, complex, and difficult tasks of public relations. They teach certain clear lessons of method; and they teach a still more important moral lesson, for they prove that to men of courage, determination, reason, and tact, no sound public task, whatever the odds, is impossible."

This historical insight can be extremely helpful today.

The major problems facing a nation—even a gestating nation—can be solved if its leaders get to work, and stay at work, until they develop and agree to reasonable and promising solutions.

We should accept the fact that any worthwhile program is certain to be controversial. Indeed, initially it could be actively distrusted by a majority of the people.

But the right kind of public relations—remember the *Federalists*!—can make the benefits of such a program understood, believed, and, finally, supported by the country.

The second national experience I consider especially relevant today is the passage and eventual impact of the graduated income tax.

To appreciate the necessity for a graduated income tax, as we know it, I need only report that Andrew Carnegie's personal income from his steel company in 1900 alone was \$20 million. And he didn't have to surrender a nickel for income taxes.

On the other hand, the average annual income of an American working family that year was less than \$500.

Obviously, a financial disparity of this dimension, had it continued, would have become social and political dynamite.

The present income-shifting device had a curious legislative history which I won't detail here. It is a fascinating story and you might be interested to know there had been two earlier Federal income taxes, one during the Civil War period, and another later declared unconstitutional.

The proposed tax eventually became law almost casually. It certainly started its career inauspiciously, as a joint resolution for a Constitutional Amendment voted in 1909 to break a deadlock over the Tariff bill.

The Senate spent less than two hours on the issue and the House an hour longer. No hearings were held and only perfunctory reports were filed.

So the graduated income tax was on its way and less than four years later the final state approved the Amendment. The new tax was appended to the Underwood Tariff bill in 1913. It was not considered separately nor voted upon.

Yet that rider—for which a majority voted merely to provide revenue should additional federal funds be needed someday—is one of the most important laws ever passed in this country, generally credited with playing a major role in the creation of the great American middle class.

There is some relevance, I believe, in this particular experience.

First, the graduated income tax law was not enacted in response to widespread agitation or with massive grassroots support.

Second, the ultimate effects of the law clearly show that it is virtually impossible

to predict what will happen when federal taxing power is used impulsively or casually.

Third, and most important, it took decades for the tax to bring about fundamental changes in our society and economy.

In the meantime other non-legislative factors played important roles in bringing about this result—notably, the benefits of mass production, sparked, it should be noted, by Henry Ford's much criticized decision in 1914 to pay \$5 for an eight-hour day, when the going rate was \$2.40 for a nine-hour day.

In sum, if we have hopes for Congressional action that will bring about another major shift in the nation's income levels to benefit those who now are in desperate need of higher income, we should be prepared for another long haul.

Unfortunately, those in need, as well as nearly all of today's major problems, cannot wait. There must be action soon, and it must become effective relatively soon.

This brings me to my third and final national experience and, perhaps, the most relevant of all. It proposes nothing less than immediate and effective action.

You'll recall I said earlier that this country invariably resorts to a kind of frontier showdown when it tries to resolve important issues that press for solutions.

Needless to say, we must put the showdown—symbolized so well by "High Noon"—behind us. It was designed for a simpler day.

Instead, I suggest we look to the gleaming launch pads of Cape Kennedy for a new symbol and a new method of solving the nation's large and complex problems.

The symbol is the countdown—that deliberate, almost hypnotic ritual which transfixes us as we watch a launching on television.

The method is the space program's approach to the tremendous, enormously complicated mission of landing an American on the moon within eight years.

I am convinced that the greatest lesson of the space program has been missed by many of us. The lesson is this:

This country can attain a goal frankly conceded at its inception as unrealistic at best and impossible at worst by deliberate planning, massive organization, and a systematic commitment of the necessary human and material resources.

The space effort is an astonishingly successful blend of government, industry, universities, science, money and people.

I need not tell you that skilled public relations and the inherent news value of space also played an important part in the success of this program. Without them, confidence and support surely would have waned during the years of research and development.

Many of us have already forgotten that the space program grew out of what we all believed at the time to be a major threat to our pride, security and technical superiority: the flight of Sputnik in October, 1957.

In retrospect, that threat could have been much larger than any that faces us today—the ghettos, pollution, traffic congestion, deficiencies in our educational system, and so on.

What is being done now by hundreds of thousands of persons inside and outside of government—and at the cost of \$20,000 million for the Apollo program alone—has given us solid reassurance about our security, as well as inspiration for the future.

For these reasons I believe it important to identify the factors that make this approach a reliable one. In my view, it may be the answer to some of our other major problems. Here, listed in simple terms, are the steps that make up my blueprint for overcoming this country's frustration complex.

First, a completely exhaustive study of every aspect of the problem to be solved. This means understanding the infinite interrelationships of the many parts of the problem and its solution.

Second, agreement on what is available to meet the needs outlined, on what is not pres-

ently available, and on what can be done and by whom to make it available as soon as possible.

Third, a decision not to be intimidated by the magnitude of the task, its expense, or the time required to perform it.

Fourth, an adequate organization of competent people—every kind of expert able to contribute, backed, in turn, by people specially trained for their varied jobs.

Fifth, absolute refusal to be stampeded into short cuts or unrealistic time schedules for meeting goals.

Sixth, a passion for perfection imposed on every participant and accepted as the norm.

Seventh, an overriding requirement that human life must be protected at all costs, and

Eighth, the capacity to rebound from failure and tragedy and to learn from mistakes.

These eight winning factors accomplished miracles in space.

I urge that we apply this pattern to the solution of the equally vast economic, social and political problems that confront us.

They are similarly made up of knowns and unknowns. They, too, require a new kind of teamwork and staggering amounts of money. They do not lend themselves to quick, easy, or cheap short cuts.

All the other factors vital to our success in space also apply—not the least of which are an overriding concern for human life and an ability to rise above temporary failures.

Our political leaders are not likely to welcome this recommendation. They will fear that their constituents would frown on any such complicated and "long-hair" approach.

Many will say, "You're just asking for more huge government programs." They don't like the idea and would prefer to escape paying the price.

The answer to them is simple: We are trying our best right now, with the methods that seem best suited. The Urban Coalition, the National Alliance of Businessmen, dozens of public and private state and local programs, scores of fine programs by corporations—all are attacking pieces of these vast problems. Most of these efforts are voluntary, however, and they require tremendous, and constant, exhortations.

Among the membership of PRSA and those they counsel are many who have given strong leadership, and I congratulate them. But it is no secret that in the private sector the large corporations are doing the most, and yet what they are doing is not nearly enough. Meanwhile, hundreds of thousands of small businesses and non-profit enterprises and organizations are making hardly any efforts at all—and this situation probably won't change much.

The solutions to urban decay, pollution, poor education, or the welfare load, will not come unless the goals, rules, and costs are apportioned fairly among large and small participants. Above all, it's got to be a game in which everyone plays.

It may well be that the next major thrust will come from private industry—as David Rockefeller urged recently—with something like the greatly effective Hoover Commission in mind.

To win in space we invented a pattern for problem-solving on a grand scale. I say let's use it; let's stretch its capability.

If we do, we may win another struggle—the struggle to regain the respect of a rebellious and idealistic youth. If we use our sophistication and competence in an enlightened war on today's national evils, we could very well surprise our young people. After all, this is their goal, too.

I recommend this course because I believe in it. I offer it here because I have confidence in you and because the first need is to stimulate discussion and examine the possibilities.

To urge seriously a countdown in place of a showdown will stir plenty of controversy. And gaining support and acceptance for the idea most likely will be an uphill effort.

But we hold unique positions. Leaders of organizations that reach nearly every segment of society depend upon us for counsel, guidance and achievement. They expect us to do our homework and, based on knowledge and judgment, to suggest workable solutions. As they learn more about the gravity of the nation's problems, I believe they will prefer the comprehensive systems approach to volunteering piecemeal commitments of time, men and money.

Many of you will find fanciful this idea I have put forward. But I believe it will appear less so the more you think about it. I am confident that sometime—let's hope sooner rather than later—this nation's leaders, public and private, will meet as they did in 1787. They will argue first, but finally they will agree to a space-program approach to our problems.

When that happens, we will have our important roles to play. We must make all Americans understand the uniqueness and practicality of the new plan. We must explain its advantages. We must win public support for the adoption of the plan.

The odds, I am happy to say, are in our favor. Almost 200 years ago four million men and women were moved in the right direction by three men. We are now 6,000 in the Public Relations Society of America, with many other competent public relations men and women still to be enlisted. Our chances to win the support of 200 million Americans are mathematically much better.

What we must contribute is the invincible combination of knowledge, skill, emotion, and love of country that made those towering Colonials truly the Founding Fathers both of our country and of our calling.

FEDERAL JUDICIARY ACCOUNTING

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL), I have today introduced a bill requiring Federal judges and Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court to file confidential financial statements with the Comptroller General.

This bill is similar to the financial disclosure provisions adopted by both House and Senate in respect to Members of the Congress and certain of their employees.

It is long past time, Mr. Speaker, for legislation of this nature. If nothing else, the revelations last year of the extra-curricular activities of Justice Abe Fortas prove the need for it.

The members of the Federal judiciary are, no less than Members of the Congress, public servants, holding high trust.

I am sure everyone recalls that it was the widely publicized extra-curricular activities of some Members of Congress, plus an especially notorious employee of the other body, that resulted in the belated formation of ethics committees in both branches of Congress.

I am sure that no one in this body wants to see the Federal judiciary receive the same kind of publicity because of the actions of some of its members.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, provides a strong deterrent to judges of the United States who might be tempted, in its absence, to engage in questionable, unethical, or even illegal practices.

I am not accusing any Federal judge

of dishonesty, but to anyone who believes that a judge is automatically removed from temptation by his elevation to the bench, I would recommend that he read "The Corrupt Judge," the well-documented and scholarly book on the subject by Joseph Borkin.

Mr. Speaker, my bill requires that Federal judges shall file, each year, copies of their tax returns and statements disclosing their stock holdings, the firms or organizations with which either they or their wives have connections or from which they receive income, and the source of any other outside income.

These sealed records shall be filed with the Comptroller General of the United States, who shall, upon passage of a resolution by either the House or Senate, deliver them to the designated committee of that body for inspection and whatever action it deems advisable.

Failure or refusal to file such a report would subject the judge to impeachment by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to hear any cries that this legislation will make second-class citizens of Federal judges. The American people have demanded that their Congressmen be held to an accounting to which they are now subject. They have a right to insist on at least as much from those who sit in judgment upon them.

EQUAL TAX RIGHTS FOR SINGLE HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, any unmarried person who maintains his or her own home should be allowed the tax benefits provided for the head of household.

Everywhere in the United States this coming April 15, single men and women will pay income taxes at substantially higher rates than married couples filing joint returns. Recognized tax authorities are agreed that the present income tax law places an unjustifiable burden on single persons.

Particularly unfair to single men and women are the "split income" provisions of the tax law which enable a married couple to divide their income for purposes of computing their income tax. Thus, they can take advantage of the lower marginal tax rates applicable to each of their incomes.

I am introducing legislation today to eliminate this inequity.

Prior to 1948 the same schedule of rates applied to all categories of taxpayers. However, husbands and wives who lived in a community-property State could divide their income between them for Federal tax purposes and pay taxes at the lower rate applicable to each segment of income. In 1948, in order to eliminate the inequities created between taxpayers in community- and noncommunity-property States legislation was enacted to allow income splitting for all married couples who filed joint returns.

The result has been a tax inequity against single persons.

Aside from a discriminatory tax rate, the split income provision is unfair on other counts. It is based on the assumption that the living costs of two persons are twice as high as those for one.

A study published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates married couples without children pay only one-third more to live than single persons.

Another justification given for income splitting is that single people should be taxed more because they do not bear the costs of raising children. But the joint return does no differentiate among married taxpayers. The rate is the same whether they have children or not.

The inequity of the income-splitting provision was modified in 1951 when the head of household category was established for some single persons who maintain a household for certain dependents or who maintain a separate household for parents.

The head of household tax status gives qualifying single individuals about half of the tax advantage that married couples receive in filing a joint return. However, the requirements for this classification are so demanding and restrictive that they exclude the vast majority of unmarried taxpayers.

Numerous bills have been introduced in the past to liberalize head of household benefits. However, many of those had serious limitations.

The single person must have attained a minimum age, usually 30 or 35; or if formerly married, he or she must have been separated or divorced for a specific period of time, usually from 1 to 3 years, to qualify as a head of household.

My bill would extend the head of household rate to any unmarried person who maintains his or her own home or who maintains a household which constitutes the principal place of abode for the taxpayer's father and mother.

Mr. Speaker, let us recognize the responsible single person by helping ease his financial burdens. At the same time we will take a step forward in eliminating the inequities in our tax structure. I urge my colleagues to support this needed legislation.

ALLOWING AN INCOME TAX EXEMPTION FOR THE FIRST \$1,500 OF COLLEGE TUITION, BOOKS, AND FEES

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the cost of sending one or more children to college is one of the major costs facing the American taxpayer with a family.

Today I am introducing a measure to give an income tax credit for the first \$1,500 of tuition, fees, books, and supplies for a student at an institution of higher learning.

The need for this tax break is evident when you consider the cost of a college education and the benefits to the economy of the Nation through increased earnings capacity.

There are over 50 million families in this Nation. Of these, 3,474,000 have

children between the ages of 18 and 24 who attend college full time. The cost is approximately \$2,778 per academic year. The cost of educating a college student has jumped phenomenally.

The pinch is being felt by families who have to pay the full educational costs for their children, but too often cannot.

The \$325 maximum credit per student allowed under the provisions of this bill would help the hard-pressed middle income family provide their children with the benefit of a college education.

It would help more students to choose a college on the basis of choice, not economic necessity.

Due to rising costs, the trend in the past few years has been a migration from privately endowed institutions to State-supported universities. In 1967-68 the national average charges for tuition and fees at all privately controlled colleges was estimated to be \$1,327, as compared to \$292 in tuition and fees for publicly controlled institutions.

The result of this overcrowding in State-supported institutions is a 21-percent increase in expenditures for living facilities.

By implementing the tax credit on the first \$1,500 of tuition, fees, books and supplies that this bill offers, a greater percentage of our future college students could choose a private institution. This would take pressure off State schools.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a blue-chip investment in the future of our Nation. That future depends on the talent and ability of our young people to meet the diverse challenges of this space age.

Peak interest rates and an inflated economy make borrowing for college tuition difficult, if not impossible, particularly when the house is mortgaged and the family car is not yet paid for. Passage of this measure would benefit many potential leaders of our country who might not otherwise be able to attend the college of their choice.

ENCOURAGE, NOT DISCOURAGE, ADVANCE CREDIT WORK BY TEACHERS

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, a group hit hard by the present tax regulations are those investing in a teaching career. What a paradox, when our Nation is becoming increasingly aware of the need for more and better teachers.

Instead of help, our tax regulations penalize those teachers who are interested in self-improvement and advancement.

Under the present Internal Revenue Service regulations, expenditures for education are deductible only if they are made to maintain or improve skills required in one's employment, trade, or business, or if they are required by the employer as a condition for retaining one's salary, status, or employment.

In the case of a teacher, this means that educational expenses are deductible only if additional education is necessary

for the teacher to maintain his current position.

A teacher who takes the initiative simply to become better qualified is denied this deduction.

In many colleges and universities throughout the country it is common to find part-time teachers who are working toward advanced degrees. There are also young teachers in secondary and elementary schools who desire improvement.

The purpose of the tax bill I am introducing today is to lift this unfair burden from the shoulders of teachers who are interested in self improvement and advancement. This legislation clarifies the Internal Revenue Code so that educational expenses for teachers can be deducted.

Teachers could deduct expenses for tuition and fees as well as expenses of travel away from home and up to \$100 per year for books and related materials.

These deductions could be claimed by part-time or full-time teachers who undertake accredited graduate work. The present regulations allowing teacher deductions would also be retained.

More teachers would be stimulated to return to college for further training and teachers pursuing advanced degrees would be encouraged to teach part time, easing critical shortages.

Mr. Speaker, the enactment of this legislation would encourage better teachers to remain within their profession. Our tax laws should encourage, not discourage, investment in a teaching career.

COMMEMORATING PROFESSIONAL BASEBALL'S CENTENNIAL

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 100th anniversary of professional baseball. As an avid fan of the sport, and as the former president of the Rochester Redwings, I have always taken pride in the fact that baseball was born in my State and much of its history centers there.

Today I am introducing a bill which would mark this historic year by providing that a commemorative stamp be issued to honor professional baseball's centennial.

In the past 100 years baseball has become more than a sport to Americans, it has become a way of life.

Originally derived from a game called "one-o'-cat" by Alexander Doubleday, it was not long before the first amateur baseball club, the New York Knickerbockers, was started in 1845. When the Cincinnati Red Stockings gave up their amateur status in 1869, professional baseball was born.

The birth of professional baseball was the beginning of a great romance between the American public and a sport which was to become "the national American pastime."

"Take Me Out to the Ball Game" and "Casey at Bat" are synonymous with peanuts, popcorn, Crackerjacks, and baseball.

Who has not experienced the thrill of a ball game. The crowd is silent as the pitcher adjusts his cap in the pitcher's box, burying the ball deep in his glove. The batter crouches and digs in deep near home plate. You can just barely see the catcher signaling to the pitcher.

The pitcher unwinds like a snapping spring, and the ball sizzles toward the plate. Suddenly the bat whips out in a fuzzy blur, a crack and the ball is gone. A left-field homer into the stands, bringing with it a mighty roar from the crowd.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the thrill of a ball game is known to us all. Baseball is a thread woven into the fabric of the American way of life.

Baseball heroes are household words. Babe Ruth, Joe Cronin, Ted Williams, Stan Musial, Joe DiMaggio, Ty Cobb, and Casey Stengel are sports immortals. Sandlot baseball and aspiring Babe Ruths are as common as sunshine in the American summertime.

There is no better way to commemorate this grand old game than to issue a stamp in its honor. I hope that all my colleagues will support this measure before Washington plays host to the 1969 All Star Game this coming July.

EXEMPTING FUNDRAISING ACTIVITIES OF VOLUNTEER FIRE AND AMBULANCE COMPANIES FROM TAXATION

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today designed to exempt special fundraising activities of volunteer fire and ambulance companies from Federal taxation.

When money is raised expressly for the purpose of buying equipment, building new stations, and training personnel in firefighting and lifesaving techniques, taxation by the Federal Government hampers the ability of these companies to protect our lives and property.

At present volunteer fire departments comprise 92 percent of all the fire departments in the country. Of the 24,000 fire departments across the Nation, 22,000 are comprised of nonpaid volunteers.

The biggest problem faced by volunteer fire departments is money. Rising prices for apparatus and equipment has made the operation increasingly difficult.

Firefighting is no longer a question of jumping off the back step and running down the street to a brush fire. The job is bigger and more dangerous than ever before. Special equipment and special training is needed to fight today's fires.

Apparatus and fire equipment designed for individual needs and specific areas is the trademark of the 20th century.

Unfortunately few local fire services have the resources to do the job properly.

Volunteer companies generally do not have the extensive building and training facilities. In addition, these departments are confronted with the problem of raising money for pumper trucks,

aerial ladder trucks and special ambulance equipment.

Nearly 60 percent of all the fire stations in use today were built between 1945 and 1960. Only 8 percent have been constructed since 1961. Facilities are still being used that were constructed prior to 1945.

By 1975 we will need 20,000 more fire stations to adequately protect our smaller population centers. The majority of these will be volunteer companies.

Local fire and ambulance departments need every penny of the money that they raise to meet the increasing demand for more facilities, equipment and training centers.

By exempting the funds that go directly to the purchase of fire and ambulance equipment, facilities construction, and training, we are putting this lost tax revenue to work for the community.

The saving of lives and property more than offsets the tax relief provided by the bill. For want of a pumper a factory is lost, as the saying goes.

In times of strife and civil disorder none of us can doubt the worthwhile work of those dedicated to rescue work nor the billions firemen save the American taxpayer.

Safety for our citizens and their property is a prime responsibility of the Federal Government and the Congress. In the interest of public safety I urge my fellow colleagues to move swiftly to enact this needed tax relief.

PROVIDING FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ASTRONAUT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

(Mr. FREY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, America's greatness does not lie in its material assets, but rather in the spirit of its people. It is this spirit, evidenced by a belief in God, courage and the will to conquer the unknown that has helped make this the greatest nation on earth.

I do not believe that a better example of the American spirit can be found than in the recent flight of Apollo 8. Our Nation and the world owe a continuing debt of gratitude to the many individuals connected with the space program, but particularly to the men who claim the proud title of astronaut. These men risk their lives daily in the service of their country. Seven astronauts—Chaffee, White, Grisom, See, Bassett, Freeman, and Williams—have been killed in the performance of duty. A fellow astronaut, Edward Givens, died in an automobile accident.

Today, I have introduced a bill providing for the establishment of an Astronaut Memorial Commission to construct, without cost to the Government, a memorial at the John F. Kennedy Space Center or its immediate vicinity. It seems fitting that this memorial should be near the point where each of the astronauts begins the journey into space. This memorial will serve as a small tribute to all astronauts, past, present, and future. And, just as important, it will serve as a constant reminder to all of

us that the American spirit will remain strong as long as there are individuals who have the courage to conquer the unknown for the benefit of their fellow man.

A SOUND MESSAGE FROM PRESIDENT NIXON ON ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

(Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the message of President Nixon on the Economic Opportunity Act is, in my judgment, a sound and important White House message. I am pleased by President Nixon's statement which both recognizes the role of the Office of Economic Opportunity while it frees OEO to perform innovative functions more effectively. I support wholeheartedly the transfer of Headstart to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as well as the transfer of the Job Corps from OEO.

There can be little question that our antipoverty efforts badly need a secure footing. These steps as outlined in the Presidential message will, I believe, go far toward consolidating the gains thus far made while recognizing the limitations placed on OEO by being bound to the operations of certain programs. These antipoverty efforts such as Headstart and Job Corps can become more effective through better coordination with the multitude of on-going programs in existing departments.

This message by the President is heartening to many of us on the Committee on Education and Labor who have spent considerable time in studying the operations of the Office of Economic Opportunity. I commend President Nixon on his forthright statement regarding the Economic Opportunity Act and intend to support him in his efforts to make more effective what the Federal Government is doing in this field.

PETE PETERSON IS STILL ON THE SCENE

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, since 1925 I have been a member of Kiwanis International, to me a very meaningful and rewarding experience. I am proud of what Kiwanis has achieved in its many years of existence. One of the men who has been one of the great leaders of Kiwanis is my close friend and neighbor, O. E. "Pete" Peterson, who, with his lovely wife, lives in the same apartment house in which my wife and I live in Miami. The story of "Pete" Peterson's contribution to Kiwanis was partially told in the January issue of the Florida Kiwanian published by the Florida District of Kiwanis International. I am sure many of my colleagues in the Congress are familiar with the magnificent contribution to Kiwanis and to our country which has been made by "Pete" Peterson and will be pleased to read this article. I, therefore, Mr. Speaker, include

this article about this distinguished American, great leader of Kiwanis, and my friend and neighbor, following my remarks in the Record:

PETE PETERSON IS STILL ON THE SCENE

When Kiwanis International held its 35th annual convention at the Dinner Key Auditorium here in 1950, Secretary O. E. Peterson stage-managed the arrangements for 10,000 visitors.

When the organization returned to Miami for annual conventions in 1954 and again in 1960, tall, angular "Pete" Peterson, as he is familiarly known to multiplied thousands of Kiwanians all over the world, was still at the controls.

And when the group comes back to the Miami-Miami Beach area once again for its 1969 convention, the lanky individual with the infectious smile and a firm handshake will continue his role of influence in the dual capacity of Secretary Emeritus of Kiwanis International and President of the Kiwanis Foundation.

There will be a slight change of address, however. A big man (six-foot-four), Peterson retired as International Secretary at the Chicago headquarters of Kiwanis in November, 1966. But it didn't last long. Leonard Usina, Board Chairman of the Peoples Group of National Banks, lured the ex-Chicagoan back into a life of business activity in South Florida with assurances there was still a lot of mileage left.

Silver-thatched Usina, active himself at 78 as the Dean of Florida bankers, convinced Peterson (now 69) that his experience in handling a \$2 million annual budget for Kiwanis International qualified him for reclassification as a banking executive. With that, the deal was struck and Peterson joined the Peoples First National Bank of Miami Shores in 1967 as an assistant Vice President in the Trust Department.

Looking back over his 30 years with Kiwanis—25 of them as International Secretary—the pipe-smoking executive with the calm, steady temperament, the genuine warmth of personality, once told fellow club members that he and his wife, Maurine, had been "singularly blessed in association with men and women whose ideals and principles were long ago took for our own. You have shown that happiness was born a twin. To enjoy it, one must share it with others." That still holds true, and that outlook on life was one of the greatest assets Peterson brought with him when he turned from Kiwanis International to the neighborly atmosphere of community banking in North Dade County.

Born in St. Paul, Minn., Peterson was graduated from the John A. Johnson High School and attended Hamline University in St. Paul, as well as the University of Chicago. He was awarded the honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters by Carthage College at Kenosha, Wis., in 1966.

"I started out in life to be a steel man," he says, recalling his early connection with the United States Steel Company in St. Paul, Gary, Ind., and Chicago. "I got my sales experience in the mills, but soon became more interested in the human side of business."

This led him into conducting Americanization classes in the evenings for the foreign-born employees of U.S. Steel at Gary. Although he was employed by the steel company, his citizenship classes were under the auspices of the YMCA, which in turn led Peterson into the YMCA's industrial relations program in South Bend, Ind. Here he spent nine years.

During this period he became active in Kiwanis, joining the Kiwanis Club in Hyde Park, Chicago, in 1929. He retained his membership there until 1967 when he transferred it to the Miami Kiwanis Club. In the meantime, in 1936, he was invited to join the Kiwanis staff in Chicago and accepted. He was appointed International Secretary in 1941.

During his 25 years as managing director of the general office, Peterson led Kiwanis in growth from 113,000 members in 2,220 clubs to 270,000 members in 5,400 clubs. Key Club International was formed, as was Circle K International. Kiwanis moved into its million-dollar home office building in 1959 during his administration, and started its program of international expansion in 1962.

Walls and shelves of Peterson's den at 2121 North Bayshore Drive, where he and his wife reside, are lined with awards, trophies and commemorative plaques presented him through the years. They include the "Liberty Bell" of U.S. Treasury Department memorializing Peterson's chairmanship of the National Organizations Committee for U.S. Savings Bonds, the "Freedom Bell" presented by the Mayor of West Berlin when Peterson was on a Radio Free Europe Mission, a silver award presented by the Boy Scouts of America, a "Certificate of Appreciation" presented by the American Public Works Association, a "Golden Apple" trophy presented by the French-speaking St. Laurent Kiwanis Club of Montreal, and many similar recognitions.

AMBASSADOR JOHN H. CRIMMINS' ADDRESS TO THE AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE IN SANTO DOMINGO

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Pepper and I, in attending the recent Seventh Inter-American Savings and Loan Conference in Santo Domingo, January 26-31, had an opportunity to observe and to learn about the outstanding work of our distinguished U.S. Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, the Honorable John Hugh Crimmins. By tact, sincere friendliness, great diligence and the keenest devotion to his work, Ambassador Crimmins, immeasurably aided by his lovely wife, has immensely strengthened the ties of understanding and friendship between the United States and the Government and people of the Dominican Republic. Our Ambassador is highly esteemed and appreciated by the Government and the people of the great Dominican Republic in doing so. We have every reason to be proud of his distinguished work.

On the 21st of November of 1968, Ambassador Crimmins, delivering a very able and eloquent address, before the American Chamber of Commerce in Santo Domingo. In this address our able Ambassador has very effectively presented the program and the policies of our country with respect to the Dominican Republic. I believe the reading of this excellent address will be a source of profit and pleasure to my colleagues and to my fellow countrymen and, therefore, I place it in full in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE JOHN HUGH CRIMMINS, AMBASSADOR OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, GIVEN BEFORE THE AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, SANTO DOMINGO, NOVEMBER 21, 1968

It is, as always, a pleasure and an honor for me to have this opportunity to speak to you this afternoon. My satisfaction is clouded somewhat by the knowledge that my appearance follows that of two particularly stimulating and thought-provoking speakers, Don Tomás Pastoriza and Don Rafael

Herrera, who have begun this year's Chamber of Commerce cycle with very important and cogent addresses. I hope that my remarks will approach the high standards they have set for the year.

Having in mind that it is just about a year since my last talk, I should like, as the first order of business today, to review major developments during the past twelve months in the programs of the United States Government which are carried out jointly with the Dominican Government in the cooperative framework of the Alliance for Progress. For the sake of continuity and easy comparison, this review will follow generally the same format as my presentation last year and will serve as an updating of the information I provided then.

Following that review, I want to make some observations about the content of the U.S. programs of cooperative assistance, particularly against the background of certain myths, misinterpretations and misconceptions which gain currency from time to time. Finally, I will make some brief comments on the future course of U.S. policy toward Latin America and U.S. cooperation with the Dominican Government and people as I myself see it at this moment in time.

First, then, a short review of the evolution during the past year of our programs of financial and technical support for economic and social development efforts in the Dominican Republic. You will recall that in my presentation last year I pointed out that, by the end of the first seventeen months of the Constitutional Government of President Balaguer—that is, through November 1967—the United States Government would have made available in AID grants and loans a total of almost 80 million dollars, which represented an average rate of about \$55 million on an annual basis. You will also recall that in my talk last year I said that, because of several uncertain factors, I could not at that time specify what the total level of United States assistance would be during 1968 but that I was confident that it would continue to be of great importance in the development effort.

How have things actually turned out in 1968?

The various agencies and institutions through which the United States Government carries out its contributions to the Alliance for Progress partnership have committed a total of approximately \$54.3 million in the Dominican Republic since the last time I spoke to this group. This total is broken down as shown in Table I.

You will note that this overall total of \$54.3 for the past year is just about the same as the average annual rate of about \$55 million attained in the first seventeen months of the Constitutional Government.

Last year I included in my remarks an account of the unexpended balances of loans from the United States Government available to the Dominican Government as 1968 was beginning. That total—corrected for the carrying over into 1968 of three development loans which both governments expected to have in operation before the end of 1967 but which were actually committed in early 1968—was \$27.4 million. The corresponding figure for the pipeline of assistance available to the Constitutional Government at the beginning of 1969 will be \$33.8 million. This total is broken down in Table II.

This review establishes that again in 1968 the level of the United States contribution to Dominican development efforts has been very high—higher, in fact, in per capita terms than in any other Latin American country. When added to the amounts made available in the previous year and a half of the Constitutional Government, the contribution since December 1, 1967 of \$54.3 million makes a grand total of \$132.2 million during the term thus far of the Constitutional Government.

It is clear that this support has permitted the Dominican Government to carry out a very broad range of development activities of an economic and social nature for which its own resources have either been insufficient or unavailable. Furthermore, this support has constituted a most important factor in maintaining the Republic's international accounts in reasonable balance. A somewhat different but likewise significant element in the balance of payments picture has been the continuation, in 1968, by the United States Government of unilateral, special allocations to the Dominican Republic of sugar in the U.S. market. The special allotment of 75,000 tons this year, when added to the special allocations in 1966 and 1967, represents a total, during the term of the Constitutional Government, of slightly more than 300,000 tons—worth about \$25 million more than could have been realized on the world market.

This short updating and recapitulation of the size and scope of the U.S. contribution of the Dominican development effort brings me to the second part of my remarks: a brief address to some of the common myths, misconceptions and criticisms about the nature and purpose of that contribution. In itself, incidentally, the first part of these remarks concerning developments in the past year serves as a commentary on the uninformed criticism that U.S. cooperation with the Dominican Republic is insignificant or negligible.

Before turning to some of the other distortions of reality, I should like to make the general observation that these myths and misconceptions have various origins. Some of their propagators act out of ignorance; others out of honest conviction or misunderstanding; and still others out of deliberate, politically motivated intent to deceive the naive and unwary and to try cynically to frustrate economic and social progress, because that progress runs counter to their clear political purpose. It is not to this last, extremist group that I address these remarks, for it has no concern for objectivity or fact or honesty but only for the pursuit, at any cost, of destructive ends, with no regard for the truth. I address myself, rather, to those who are genuinely concerned with the complex and difficult problems of Dominican development, who have doubts or uncertainties, who are seeking facts, and who are sincerely open to dialogue.

One of the most frequent complaints about U.S. financial and technical cooperation is that it is—allegedly—onerous, either in the sense that it imposes a heavy repayment burden on the Dominican Republic or that it is tied to the procurement of goods and services in the United States. The first myth can be dispelled very quickly with a simple review of the facts. Since mid-1965, when the sharp expansion of U.S. assistance began, the total value of U.S. financial and technical assistance to the Dominican Republic has been \$202 millions. Of this amount, \$66 million have been in the form of donations, with no repayment required. About \$136 million have come in the form of loans. With the exception of \$14.4 million in loans from the Eximbank to the CDE—an industrial enterprise capable of amortizing debt over a reasonable period—and the \$10.5 million in PL 480 programs, these loans have carried extremely soft terms: 10 years of grace, followed by 30 years for amortization, with interest at a rate of no more than two per cent during the grace period and two and one half per cent thereafter. The terms of the two Exim loans have been three years grace and fourteen years of amortization, with interest at six per cent or lower. The PL 480 loan calls for a five per cent down payment, two years' grace, an amortization period of 19 years, with an interest rate of two per cent during the grace period and two and one half per cent thereafter.

The point can be made in another way. In 1967, the first full year of the present government, the Dominican Republic repaid \$5.4 million to the U.S. Government for AID, EXIMBANK and PL 480 loans, and one special U.S. Treasury loan, made since 1962. Also during 1967, AID alone disbursed about \$53 million in loans and grants. In 1968, the Dominican Government will repay to the U.S. Government an estimated \$4.7 million, while at least \$33 million in AID and PL 480 credit programs will have been disbursed. In 1969, the Dominican repayment to the U.S. Government for loans signed as of now will be \$4.9 million; in 1970, \$5.4 million; in 1971, \$4.6 million; in 1972, \$4.9 million; in 1973, 1974 and 1975, \$5.0 million; in 1976, \$6.0 million; in 1977, \$7.3 million; in 1978, \$8.1 million; and in 1979 and 1980, at the beginning of the next decade, \$8.2 million. I submit that by any reasonable and responsible standard that level of scheduled repayments is hardly onerous.

The fact that the dollars provided by U.S. assistance are normally tied to purchases either in the Dominican Republic or the United States has generated a great many myths and misunderstandings, some the result of confusion, others the product of deliberate distortion. One of these holds that all the dollars made available by the United States Government are used exclusively to buy equipment from the United States for use on projects being carried out jointly by the two governments; therefore there is no positive effect on the balance of payments and indeed the loans are merely a clever device to promote U.S. exports. This is false. The reality is that in the Dominican Republic an especially low proportion—about 20 per cent—of dollars from AID loans have been utilized to buy equipment for projects financed by those loans—for example, medical equipment for clinics and hospitals, pumping equipment for the Haina well field, dryers for grain storage silos, etc. The dollars from the remaining 80 per cent, which are used for peso expenditures in the Dominican Republic, have been available to the Dominican Central Bank for financing commercial imports that normally come from the United States.

The requirement that U.S. dollars made available on extremely soft terms be utilized for purchases from the United States is in keeping with the practice of other countries which provide development assistance and which are also concerned with their balance of payments situations. In the case of the United States, by far the largest contributor of support to the development efforts of the underdeveloped countries, the necessity to reduce the negative effects of foreign assistance on its balance of payments is especially marked because of the importance to world finance and commerce of the dollar as a reserve currency. It would be highly imprudent under present circumstances for the United States to make dollars directly available for imports from other countries. Even so, it is very important to note that U.S. programs of assistance in the Dominican Republic have also permitted higher Dominican imports of goods produced in countries other than the United States. The Dominican Central Bank has increasingly been able to finance regular imports from the United States with additional dollars made available through AID loans, and, correspondingly, the Bank has been enabled to reduce the use of its "free" dollars (those accruing from Dominican exports and capital inflows) for U.S. goods. In turn, this has made more Dominican foreign exchange available for purchases from other countries.

What has happened is that, despite the very large transfer of resources from the U.S. Government to the Dominican Government through AID loans, the proportionate share of the Dominican market held by U.S. exporters has not increased significantly

while the greater availability of "free" dollars made possible by U.S. balance of payments assistance to the Dominican Republic has enhanced the trading opportunities of other developed countries. Many of those countries are at present in a better balance of payments position than the United States, and all of them, it should be noted, have favorable balances of trade with the Dominican Republic, whereas the United States buys from the Dominican Republic at least 40 per cent more than it sells. (In 1967, for example, the Dominican Republic exported products valued at \$134 million to the United States while it imported products valued at \$96 million from the United States.) This situation, representing substantial indirect financing by the U.S. Government of the exports of other developed countries, continues to be of concern to us, and its amelioration is the subject of constant study.

There is a further myth involving other developed countries which deserves examination in the cold light of fact and reality. This is the one which claims that the United States desires a monopoly position for its assistance and that in some occult way we are interested in preventing the provision of assistance by other countries. The simple truth is that, ever since the Alliance for Progress took form, the United States has constantly urged friendly developed countries with interests in Latin America to play a more active role in the development process through long-term, low-interest loans and technical assistance grants. We have been aware for a long time that U.S. resources available for the development programs of other countries are insufficient for the enormous task involved. Indeed, the United States Government has been active in forming and participating in lending consortia with European and the Japanese governments and private institutions in underdeveloped countries throughout the world. I want to say as forcefully as I can that it is not the objective of the U.S. Government to exclude assistance from non-U.S. sources and that we have not attempted to dissuade the Dominican Government from obtaining resources elsewhere.

A number of the misconceptions about the programs of economic cooperation in which we participate are encompassed in the general, rather vague statement one hears from time to time that they are not really responsive to Dominican needs or, as the phrase goes, to the Dominican reality. The specifics of this charge—when specifics are given—include the following: Some say that our assistance is too heavily devoted to the agriculture sector and does not pay enough attention to industrial development. To this is sometimes added the claim that the United States is deliberately opposed to industrialization because it wants to keep the Dominican Republic poor and dependent on agricultural exports and as a lucrative market for manufactured exports. Others say that the joint programs financed by the United States do not concentrate sufficiently on agriculture, which is and will continue to be the economic base of the country. Some say that we ignore social progress and reform in favor of economic production. Others say that our assistance is too socially oriented and that resources dedicated to public health and education should be channeled exclusively into the directly productive sectors. Some say that we are interested only in maintaining the status quo and that our assistance does not reach or is not intended to reach "the little man." Others say that our contributions to the Dominican efforts to bring about social and economic progress and reform are creating instability by encouraging the aspirations of the masses of the people.

Although a good many of these complaints are mutually contradictory and inconsistent and are sometimes made indiscriminately out of hostility, I fully appreciate that,

when they are advanced by serious-minded persons, they reflect a healthy and laudable preoccupation with the complexities and difficulties of the development process and a natural desire to find as much precision as possible in a necessarily and notoriously imprecise field of human endeavor. The complaints, therefore, warrant examination.

I should like to consider first the question of the significance—and relationship—of the agricultural and industrial sectors. I think it is a truism to say that both sectors demand urgent attention and stimulation because the healthy development of both is essential to sound economic and social progress. Both are receiving that attention and impetus in the projects in which we participate. Because, however, of a number of factors, among them the rich natural endowment of the Dominican Republic, the basic agricultural orientation of its population, the acute problems of the "second nation" as Don Rafael Herrera has described the backward *campo*, the pressing need to meet the difficult balance of payments situation by increasing agricultural production in order to reduce imports and increase exports, and the greater prospects for quick results, the Dominican Government and AID have accorded highest priority to agriculture.

In keeping with this priority, the very promising agricultural sector has received the largest share of U.S. Government resources during the past three years. Of the \$71.6 millions of global assistance which have generated pesos for investment purposes since June 30, 1966, \$40.8 million, or 57 per cent, have been and are being programmed directly or indirectly for agricultural development. Major new programs of agricultural credit and price stabilization have been and are being mounted. Almost seven million pesos have been and are being used for the rehabilitation of irrigation systems. Additional millions of pesos have been and are being employed to build penetration roads and to improve the existing road network to facilitate the flow of agricultural production to market. Several hundreds of thousands of pesos have been used to build new municipal markets which assure better products and lower prices to the consumer as well as better and more even prices for producers. With both financial and technical assistance, new, higher-yielding varieties of basic agricultural products have been and are being developed in experimental facilities made possible by U.S. resources, and distributed to the *campo*. Better cultivation techniques are being demonstrated to farmers by Dominican and U.S. technicians working together. Seven million pesos have been earmarked by AID to assist in the construction of the Tavera Dam, which is more important to agriculture, through improved irrigation, than it is even to the industrial sector.

In a very real sense, Tavera, it seems to me, epitomizes the impossibility of trying to consider or deal with the two basic sectors of the economy as distinct or competitive. Obviously they are complementary and mutually reinforcing. Despite its basic agricultural orientation and natural advantages, the Dominican Republic cannot assure itself of sound development on the basis of agriculture alone. Much, if not most, of agricultural production requires on-the-spot processing for preservation and marketing purposes. The strength of this assertion should be apparent from recent developments here in the Dominican Republic with respect to tomato products, milk products, *grandules* and beet products.

But there is a further consideration which vitiates the possibility of sustained development based on the agricultural sector alone. As we have learned at great economic and social cost over the past 40 years in the United States, agricultural technology, particularly increased mechanization, has

rapidly displaced large numbers of agricultural workers. The lesson, particularly for underdeveloped economies which face high levels of unemployment, is crystal clear. Agriculture by itself is not going to solve the problem of unemployment, at least not in the long run. Industrialization, related not only to the agricultural sector but also to other sectors, for example, minerals and consumer goods, is essential.

Programs in which we have cooperated in the Dominican Republic reflect our appreciation of this fact. In addition to the thermo-electric power plants that the ExIm Bank has financed in Santo Domingo, Puerto Plata and Haina, AID is participating with the Inter-American Development Bank, through the IDB's Fund for Special Operations, about 75 per cent of the capital of which is subscribed by the U.S. Government, in the financing of Tavera. The IDB and AID have helped to capitalize FIDE, the Fondo de Inversiones para el Desarrollo Económico. During the past two years, FIDE has loaned, through commercial banks, the Banco Agrícola, and the Corporación de Fomento Industrial, almost \$10 million for new or expanded industries in the Dominican Republic. AID has helped to establish the Financiera Dominicana, a private development bank, which has lent more than \$500,000 for industrialization projects in its first few months of existence. A substantial contribution by AID has been indispensable to the completion of the Camer metallurgical complex, now called Metaldom. Technical assistance has also been provided to several institutions which help to promote an accelerated rate of industrialization, and we are very interested in cooperating with sound programs for the development of the tourist industry, which can be of great importance to the growth of the general economy.

The facts about our support for the movement toward industrialization belie by themselves the allegation that we want to inhibit the installation of industries in order to preserve markets for our own manufacturers and to preserve the Dominican Republic as a poor supplier of agricultural products. The inherent contradiction in this formulation which is often advanced by some well-defined groups is obvious, but, beyond that, surely no serious person can think that the United States is unaware of the prime economic fact that the richer and more industrialized a country becomes the better market it affords.

Moving from the discussion of our posture toward the relationship between the agricultural and industrial sectors, I want to touch briefly now on the question of our attitude toward the balance between development of those productive sectors and social development. Here again it is simply not possible, in my judgment, to make arbitrary and artificial distinctions. Apart from the existence of the great moral need to satisfy the demands of human dignity, there is the practical consideration that a *campesino* who has access to improved educational and health facilities and attention is very apt to be a more productive member of the society. Surely the child of an urban worker who can enjoy the flexibility of choice of vocation afforded by more modern high schools and who can take advantage of the availability of expanded hospital facilities—surely he is apt to contribute more to the country's well-being than his father had been able to. It is, moreover, no exaggeration to say that a well-trained, adequately paid teacher is the keystone of economic development.

This indissoluble link between social and economic development was a cardinal principle set forth by the Latin American framers of the Alliance for Progress. It has served as the guide to our cooperation with the Dominican Government in the fields of health, education and water supply. During the past three years, AID resources made available to

the Dominican Government have played an important role in the construction, expansion, and equipping of urban and rural schools, hospitals and clinics. In that period, about 870 school classrooms, eight hospitals and 14 clinics have been built or expanded with AID funds. Technical assistance has been made available at all levels in education, ranging from primary schools to the three universities in the country. Two of the most recent expansions of the Santo Domingo water supply system—the pipeline from the Haina infiltration gallery and the Haina well field now under construction—have been financed by AID. Earlier this year, AID authorized substantial development loans in health and education, for \$7 million and \$12 million, respectively. These two loans—both on very easy terms—were jointly prepared by AID technicians and Dominican Government technicians and authorities. They are now under study by the Dominican Government.

The average Dominican, the "little man," to whom I have referred, is, despite the mythical allegations to the contrary, the primary concern of our participation in the economic and social development process in this country. It has always been and will continue to be an objective of the utmost importance for me and the leadership of the AID Mission to find ways in which our assistance can more effectively reach the little man and improve his opportunities for a better life.

I can think of no program in which we are involved which does not, either directly or at but one remove, have as its effect the improvement in some way of the lot of the average Dominican. I should like to invite you to cast your mind over the programs which I have mentioned earlier in other contexts to appreciate their indirect effects. As only two examples, I point out, first, our support of FIDE which stimulates new investment in industries, thus expanding employment opportunities in the cities and, with respect particularly to new agro-industries, in the countryside; and, second, our technical assistance in producing better seeds which enable the small *campesino* to obtain larger and higher quality crops.

Many of the programs provide both immediate and long-term benefits for the average man. For example, those Dominican Government public works programs in which we participate—the rehabilitation of irrigation canals, the construction of feeder roads, potable water systems, hospitals, schools, etc.—have given employment to thousands of workers during the construction phase and, when completed, constitute either improved social services or the means for greater production and an increased number of permanent jobs.

Many other programs work directly with the little man. Small farmers are now benefiting from the substantial resources that have been made available to the *Instituto de Desarrollo y Crédito Cooperativo* (IDECOOP). This assistance, which has included both financial and technical help, has been an important factor in the impressive growth of the Dominican cooperative movement. An indicator of this growth is the number of members of cooperatives: in 1966 approximately 14,000 Dominicans belonged to cooperatives; the current figure is approximately 28,000. The Dominican Government now has under study a \$2.6 million development loan authorized by AID earlier this year for the expansion of loans to cooperatives. An important—and increasing—portion of our substantial technical assistance in agriculture is aimed at the small farmer. This technical assistance has permitted the initiation of a major new supervised credit program which has gotten underway in the last few weeks and which should have highly important consequences, both in terms of increased income for the small farmer and new production for local consumption and export.

Almost three million pesos generated by AID programs have been earmarked for the expanding programs of the Agrarian Institute. Together with substantial resources made available by the Government, these pesos have permitted an acceleration of both the distribution of land and the bringing of land into the production of cash crops. In the process, several thousand farm families have shifted from subsistence to cash production, improving their own standard of living and providing additional demand for other products. AID has also made 8.7 million dollars available for the programs of the Office of Community Development, which, in addition to its efforts to improve the economic and social environment of the *campesino*, has brought to the rural areas of the Dominican Republic the concept of the importance of self-help and local initiative. As you probably know, more than one-half of the resources made available for community development projects come from the involved people themselves. Finally, PL 480 programs, both grants and loans, have meant less strain on the pocketbooks of Dominican consumers.

Our efforts to bring the message of the Alliance for Progress to the people have not stopped at the rural areas. AID assistance has been made available to several promising urban development community programs. AID resources are helping the Comisión de Ornato Cívico to improve urbanization in Santo Domingo, particularly the less affluent parts of the city, at the same time providing employment to hundreds of workers. Several hundred thousands pesos have been made available to establish credit resources for artisans and small businessmen. Finally, particularly through the savings and loan associations which are integrated with the Banco Nacional de la Vivienda, but also through the Instituto Nacional de la Vivienda and AID guarantees for lower and middle class housing projects, upwards of \$10 million has been made available to families who want to own their own home and who would probably otherwise not have been able to do so.

I have tried to address myself to some of the prevalent misconceptions about the intent and nature of our support of Dominican development. The list is not exhausted, but before I close I want to examine with you perhaps the greatest of these myths. It holds that the U.S. Government is not really interested in sustained economic and social development in Latin America, that it is opposed to fundamental change, and that the resources it makes available are no more than a palliative or window-dressing designed to disguise our commitment to the status quo. Implicit in this myth is the wholly mistaken idea that the United States believes that it benefits, economically or politically or both, from a continuation of existing conditions in Latin America. Nothing could be more erroneous.

There is nothing mysterious or obscure about our reasons for trying to help others to help themselves. They are quite simple. We believe that the people of the United States can live better and more securely in a world in which the disparity between the rich and the poor is diminished, not enlarged. We believe that a world divided between the prosperous and the poverty-stricken is an unstable and an unhealthy world. We believe that, in an age when instability in any country can reverberate around the globe, our own pursuit of happiness, our own quest for the solution of our own great social problems, is enhanced by stability elsewhere. We believe that "stability" and the "status quo" are not at all synonymous, because in countries in the grip of the acute economic, social and political problems of underdevelopment, the status quo is, soon or late, a likely breeder of instability. We believe that stability can come only with sustained and broad-based development. We believe that the greater the economic and social progress of the developing countries, the greater our own

material well-being. We believe that, as hunger and poverty and disease and ignorance retreat, freedom advances; and as they advance, dictatorship and tyranny flourish. We believe that our wealth and our power, our traditions and our values, and human solidarity, oblige us to assist other nations to develop their economies, improve the living conditions of their peoples, and take their rightful place in the world—self-confident, self-reliant, free and independent.

These are the reasons, together with our natural and historic interests in this hemisphere, which have caused us to join with the other nations of the continent in a mutual—not a unilateral—effort called the Alliance for Progress to undertake the enormous task of conquering disease and poverty and ignorance through more rapid economic and social development.

The motives that led us to participate in the Alliance are as valid today as they were in August of 1961 when the Charter was signed, and as they were in September of 1960 when, in the Act of Bogotá, the Government of President Eisenhower and then Vice-President Nixon joined with the Latin American governments to prepare the ground for what a year later was to become the Alliance.

This continuity of interest is reflected in the statements of now President-Elect Nixon during the campaign and in his recent post-election declarations. Although I am obviously unable to speak for the new Administration, it is my personal conviction that United States policy toward Latin America will continue to be guided by the basic principles and considerations which have underlain it for a decade. I would expect that, quite naturally, there will be changes in emphasis and style, but that the historic American interest in and concern for Latin America will in no way be diminished.

Here in the Dominican Republic, we hope to conclude a new PL 480 agreement with the Constitutional Government in the near future. This agreement will probably cover the importation until June 30, 1969, of commodities valued at about \$9 million, thus relieving the Dominican balance of payments to that extent and generating an equivalent amount of pesos for use in jointly agreed upon projects, particularly in agriculture. There is a good possibility that still another PL 480 program will be considered after June, 1969, for the second half of the year, amounting to approximately \$6 million. I have already referred in earlier sections of

these remarks to the three development loans for the educational sector, public health and cooperatives totalling \$21.7 million which were authorized by Washington earlier in 1968 and which are now being considered by the Dominican Government. In addition, we expect that the feeding programs of the voluntary agencies will be maintained during 1969 as will the provision of substantial donations for technical assistance.

As I conclude this annual address, I believe that I am warranted in saying again this year that, although I am not able to define with precision the amount of our assistance to the Dominican Republic in 1969, I am sure that it will continue to play a role of great importance as a supplement and reinforcement of Dominicans' own efforts. As I trust I have made clear in these remarks, the United States has been engaged in a broad-ranging, complex but balanced program of cooperation with the Constitutional Government. Its fundamental purpose has been to fulfill our obligation under the Alliance for Progress to help improve the life of the little man. That obligation and the reasons for it persist. I am confident that it will continue to be met.

TABLE I.—U.S. ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE, JUNE 30, 1966, TO NOV. 30, 1968

Date	General purpose	Amount (in millions)		
		June 30, 1966,	Dec. 1, 1967,	
		Nov. 30, 1967	Nov. 30, 1968	
AID loans:				
Oct. 5, 1966	Agricultural bank.....	\$9.5	} 40 years, 10 years grace. Interest: 1 percent 1st 10 years, 2½ percent thereafter; semiannual repayments.	
Apr. 26, 1967	Community development.....	8.7		
June 30, 1968	Plan de emergencia.....	} 40.0		
Dec. 9, 1966	do.....			
Apr. 1, 1967	do.....			
June 14, 1967	Santo Domingo urban improvement.....	5.0	} 40 years, 10 years grace. Interest: 2 percent 1st 10 years, 2½ percent thereafter; semiannual repayments.	
Jan. 10, 1968	Feasibility studies.....	\$2.0		
Do	Educational credit.....	1.4		
Mar. 28, 1968	Financiera.....	5.0		
Apr. 1, 1968	Supporting assistance.....	16.1		
Subtotal AID loans.....		63.2	24.5	
Agricultural commodity sales agreements (Public Law 480): Apr. 1, 1968.			10.5	5 percent immediate repayment, 2 years grace, 19 years amortization. Interest: 2 percent 1st 2 years, 2½ percent thereafter; annual repayments.
AID grants:				
Food for peace:				
July 1, 1966 to June 30, 1967	Feeding programs.....	5.2		
July 1 to Nov. 30, 1967	do.....	.6		
Dec. 1, 1967 to Nov. 30, 1968	do.....		7.9	
Technical assistance:				
July 1, 1966, to June 30, 1967	Technical advisers, participant training, commodities.....	6.6		
July 1 to Nov. 30, 1967	do.....	2.3		
Dec. 1, 1967, to Nov. 30, 1968	do.....		5.1	
Subtotal, AID grants.....		14.7	13.0	
Export-Import Bank loan.....			6.3	
Total.....		77.9	54.3	(\$132.2 for June 30, 1966, to Nov. 30, 1968 period.)

40 years, 10 years grace. Interest: 1 percent 1st 10 years, 2½ percent thereafter; semiannual repayments.

40 years, 10 years grace. Interest: 2 percent 1st 10 years, 2½ percent thereafter; semiannual repayments.

5 percent immediate repayment, 2 years grace, 19 years amortization. Interest: 2 percent 1st 2 years, 2½ percent thereafter; annual repayments.

(\$132.2 for June 30, 1966, to Nov. 30, 1968 period.)

TABLE II.—U.S. LOANS TO THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC HAVING UNDISBURSED BALANCES AS OF JAN. 1, 1969

[In millions]		
	Amount of loan	Estimated undisbursed balance as of Jan. 1, 1969
AID loans:		
National housing bank.....	\$5.0	\$1.4
Agricultural bank.....	9.5	3.8
Community development.....	8.7	5.0
S.D. urban improvement.....	5.0	2.5
Feasibility studies.....	2.0	1.8
Educational credit.....	1.4	.9
Financiera.....	5.0	4.0
Supporting assistance.....	16.1	8.1
Export-Import Bank loan:		
Electric corporation (CDE).....	6.3	6.3
Total of pipeline.....		33.8

¹ May be disbursed in December 1968.

PUBLIC HEALTH CIGARETTE SMOKING ACT OF 1969

(Mr. FOUNTAIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, my 10 colleagues from our State of North Carolina and I are today introducing the Public Health Cigarette Smoking Act of 1969.

The purpose of this bill is simple. It is to keep within the Congress the rightful authority and responsibility to make decisions on public policy involving controversial subjects.

The Federal Communications Commission has served notice on the Congress, which created the Commission, that unless the Congress takes certain

action the FCC intends to ban altogether any advertising of cigarettes over the Nation's radio and television stations.

This, in our opinion, is something that the FCC has no statutory or constitutional authority to do. If it can arbitrarily ban one product, however legally manufactured and sold, what is to stop it from banning others?

We do not accept the FCC's interpretation of its responsibilities and obligations, as it has stated them in relation to this subject. And, while we deplore the necessity of Congress having to respond to such threats as the one issued by the FCC, we nevertheless do not hesitate to take the necessary action to reassert the traditional and constitutional role of the Congress in such matters.

The bill we are introducing today

would simply extend and make permanent the present cigarette labeling act which is scheduled to expire June 30.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the Public Health Cigarette Smoking Act of 1969.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

MOVIES FROM HOME

(Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, because of the Lincoln Day recess, I was denied the privilege to be present at the mid-winter conference of the Ladies Auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars when Sammie G. Feeback, of our home area, was honored at a special award ceremony here in Washington, D.C. It should be recalled that Sammie is the cameraman of WDAF-TV in Kansas City who started putting messages from wives and children on film to send to our servicemen in Vietnam.

Mrs. Lora Waters, president of the VFW auxiliary later adopted the project as a national idea. It expanded and extended to the point that over 3,000 film segments have been sent to Vietnam as of February 1, 1969, from 26 metropolitan cities in 18 States. But it was Sammie Feeback from WDAF-TV in Kansas City who started the idea and who persuaded his employer to make Christmas messages for servicemen in Vietnam as far back as 1964. All told, Sammie Feeback has helped VFW auxiliary members to initiate the filming of 3,000 3-to-5-minute film segments of wives, parents, children, and pets of servicemen overseas.

It is my privilege at this point to acknowledge the contribution to this project and the assistance to Feeback of Richard M. Maloney, a constituent, who heads a Kansas City advertising company and is a colonel in the Air Force Reserves assigned to the 10th Air Force Headquarters at Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base situated in the Fourth Congressional District. It was most appropriate that Colonel Maloney, of Belton, Mo., was present at the Feeback award ceremony as was Gen. William D. Greenfield, commander of the Central NORAD Region, 10th Air Force Command and Col. Thomas A. Personett, representing Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base.

Sammie Feeback who sometimes goes by the description of cinematographer, richly deserves the VFW salute because of his vital role in developing this filming as a national project of the VFW auxiliary. The plaque presented to him reads:

The Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars salutes Sammie G. Feeback whose generous contribution of time, energy and high professional skill made it possible for thousands of overseas servicemen to receive Movies from Home, February 1969.

TEN THOUSAND HORSES

(Mr. RANDALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, Americans are fond of superlatives. This, I suppose, is the underlying reason every Member of Congress is proud to claim a "first" or "biggest," when it happens in his congressional district.

Accordingly, it is with a justifiable measure of pride that I can announce that Houstonia, Mo., which I am privileged to represent, can legitimately lay claim to at least two superlatives. First, it is the home of the first 10,000 horsepower engine with a 12,500 rating, under certain conditions, which is the largest engine used anywhere in the world in the operation of gas transmission. It will be the heart of the largest block of compressed horsepower ever constructed. It can move 475 million cubic feet of gas a day or an amount equal to that used in an entire year by all the residential, industrial and commercial customers in a city the size of Detroit.

The second superlative associated with these 10,000 horses is the fact that this concentration of horsepower and the great capability which it possesses has been achieved for the first time without the usual comparable increase in size. This huge engine is no bigger than twice the height of an average man. This great power in such a small package is another outstanding "first."

The massive engine is the largest along the entire Panhandle system which kicks natural gas along a 1,000-mile journey from the southwest to consumers in more populous sections of the United States and even some provinces of Canada. To show the size of the Houstonia engine, Panhandle Eastern added only 43,000 horsepower to all the stops along its lines in 1968. Yet, this one engine represents roughly one-fourth of the entire horsepower added during all the year.

While the engine is compact and is small in comparison with the usual huge size of an engine with so much horsepower, it weighs 343,000 pounds and when all compressors, manifolds, coolers, turbo chargers and other auxiliary equipment are added, the total weight is 725,000 pounds.

This biggest concentration of horsepower contains so much of a design innovation that a special representative of the manufacturer will have to spend another year at Houstonia, as he puts it, "baby sitting" to be certain no problems develop.

The huge V-type, 16-cylinder reciprocating engine has a 20-inch bore and a 20-inch stroke. More important than these statistics is the fact this engine has much more than size going for it; it has about 2 percent savings in fuel over smaller engines and a substantial saving over the fuel needed if two engines had been installed to achieve the same horsepower capability of this great engine which is known as the Z-330.

It is with justifiable pride that I have taken the time to point out this really important "first" particularly when some

of our news media make such a great point and proceed to give so much space to what is played up as so important a thing as the first case of cold sniffles in outer space.

Pettis County, Houstonia, Mo., and all the Fourth Missouri Congressional District can, without being either immodest or appear to be lacking in humility announce to the world that they are the home of a really important superlative. We have the most unique power package of its kind ever assembled with the power of 10,000 horses concentrated in an engine no bigger than twice the height of an average man.

COMPUTERIZED SYSTEM TO KEEP TRACK OF LEGISLATION OF BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

(Mr. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, in this session of Congress, the Banking and Currency Committee is instituting the first computerized system to keep track of all legislation which falls under its jurisdiction. This is definitely a major step in the modernization of the procedures of the Congress.

In a letter sent to all Members by Congressmen PATMAN and WIDNALL, they stated:

As you know, a large portion of the workload of the Members of Congress and their staffs is devoted to answering verbal and written requests for the status and summary of legislation pending before legislative committees. Although many of us have come to regard the winnowing of such information as "legislative research", it is nothing of the sort. Instead, we feel that the status and summary of pending measures should be routinely available . . . thus relieving you and your staff for more productive tasks.

I agree wholeheartedly with the above statement and sincerely hope that this system works out.

However, I would like to apply the same logic to committee hearings and legislative reports. A great amount of valuable information is contained in these documents; however, many times, congressional staffs must spend hours ferreting out the needed material. Thus, I am reintroducing a bill to require committee staffs to index all printed committee hearings and legislative reports over 25 pages in length. To a limited extent, the Senate Library indexes some committee hearings, and the House Committee on Internal Security indexes its hearings by witness. I believe that indexing by name of witness, subject matter, date, and other appropriate points of reference would help Members, their staffs and scholars in gathering useful information from committee hearings.

LUCRETIA C. MOTT

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of this session, January 3, 1969, I had the distinct pleasure of participating in a most stimulating and thought provoking memorial service for Lucretia C. Mott. This service was held in the crypt of the Capitol and was sponsored by the National Woman's Rights Party, of which Mrs. Emma Guffy Miller is president. Mrs. Miller presided at the service, and by her comments throughout the program, added immensely to its depth and meaning.

The primary purpose of this service was to honor Lucretia Mott, who was one of the founders of the woman's rights movement in this country, and one of the movement's most articulate advocates. The program was even broader in scope, however, and it served to remind us once again of the goals of the National Woman's Party, and the wonderful work which it has accomplished on behalf of women's rights.

Mr. Speaker, the memorial service was of such a high caliber that I would like to share the remarks made during the service with my colleagues. The proceedings were as follows:

LUCRETIA MOTT AND HER CONTRIBUTIONS

Born in the year of 1793, when the nation was four years to live to year 1880 or 87 fruitful years of service to humanity. She was a Quaker by birth and conviction. Her intelligence and capabilities assisted her in becoming a preacher and a great teacher.

Lucretia Mott was the real founder and the soul of the woman's rights movement in America and England. She was the outstanding feminine worker in the struggle to rid our country of slavery. She advocated labor unions in a day when they were almost unknown and generally considered illegal. She proscribed war and worked diligently for liberal religion. For the true religion—the religion of concern with action.

A woman of rare refinement, yet she was not afraid to challenge the evils of her day, or to speak upon the public platform, an act then considered unwomanly and indecent.

These achievements, combined with her undeniably beautiful character and innate spirituality, is why she is known as the "Greatest American Woman." No woman in American history ever combined so many outstanding talents or participated influentially in so many varied movements, and with such grace of charm, as Lucretia Mott. She was great in deeds, great in womanhood, and great in those attributes of femininity that women strive for, and men demand.

In her many controversies she never lost the poise of womanly dignity. She was always essentially true to her sex. We are told she grew old beautifully, so that every wrinkle in her face was the accolade of Time in the ripeness of experience.

In her day, America, as now, was rocked with a great economic problem—slavery—defended as entrenched greed always is defended. America had its nation-shaking disputes over the Constitution, its vigilantes, and a Supreme Court controversy that came to a climax with the Dred Scott decision. America, then as now, had its conservatives, reactionaries, radicals, liberals and that inert mass of people who talk up progress until suddenly they discover it cannot be accomplished without ridicule and sacrifice of social and business prestige, whereupon they become suddenly very "Sound" in their views and adhere to old abuses.

Our Nation needs today the enlightened

liberalism, a spirit of moderation, the sanity, and the sincerity of purpose of this great woman who did much, the women of America, the right to go upon the public forum to discuss living issues of our century. Let us not fail as carriers of the responsibility she entrusted to our hands.

Theodore Tilton, a great journalist of the Civil War period said, "In the same sense in which the greatest man ever produced in this country was Benjamin Franklin, the greatest woman ever produced in this country is Lucretia Mott."

Sensing problems of her time she became a leader and abolitionist. She organized the Female Anti-Slavery Society and became its leader. She journeyed to London, only to be refused admission as a delegate to the World's Anti-Slavery Convention because of her sex. She then went to Elizabeth Cady Stanton in Seneca Falls, New York to organize and began to work for Women's Rights movement.

On religion she boldly prophesied the coming of the day when there would be a universal religion. The Great Spirit of the Indian, the Quaker, the Blessed Mary of the Catholics, and Brahma of the Hindoo would she prophesied eventually to become the same thing. When this was accomplished she said, "There would come such a faith, and such liberty, as should redeem the world."

She would recognize the grouping of churches today and welcome the change. How she would have gloried in that day when all religious leaders joined in the famous march from the Washington monument to the Lincoln monument to hear Martin Luther King utter those famous words "I had a dream."

I gladly join all of you today to honor this great pioneer. This great female character has had a wholesome influence she has had on the lives of millions in her time and millions since her active life was stilled by death. She belongs here in statue form so we may be reminded of the great spirit that should burn in our heart and minds today.

As a paraphrase from the words of Lincoln, Here truly is a character and life "to hold against the sky to match the mountain and the sea."

I am glad to have the honor to join you in doing honor to her and to be with you as you seek to make other men wiser and better.

QUESTION OF BANK INFLUENCE AT TREASURY DEPARTMENT STILL UNRESOLVED

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, there has been much concern about potential conflicts among President Nixon's appointees to the Treasury Department.

This morning, the top policymaking officials appeared before the Joint Economic Committee and I questioned them in detail about their connections with the commercial banking industry.

While I have nothing personal against any of these gentlemen, I remain totally unsatisfied that these officials can successfully exercise judgment independent from their present and past ties and associations with the commercial banks.

This morning I questioned the Secretary of the Treasury, David Kennedy, who was chairman of the Continental Illinois National Bank of Chicago. I discovered that he had not disposed of his bank stock, but that he had simply

placed it in trust. He estimated that the stock represented a market value of more than \$1.2 million.

Although Secretary Kennedy indicated that the trust was independent and that the stockholdings would be diversified, I still do not regard this as a satisfactory arrangement for an official whose day-to-day decisions so closely affect the banking industry. If Secretary Kennedy should leave office tomorrow, next month, or next year, the holdings now in trust would return to his immediate control, including any remaining bank stock.

Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly convinced that Secretary Kennedy must sell all of his bank stock if he is to successfully carry out his public duties.

Also appearing this morning before the Joint Economic Committee were Charles E. Walker, the former executive vice president of the American Bankers Association, and Paul Volcker, a former vice president of the Chase Manhattan National Bank. Both of these men testified that they did not own stock in commercial banks.

However, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that all three of these men—who must now set banking policies—cannot disassociate themselves from their past relationships in the banking community. It would have been much better if President Nixon had placed these men elsewhere in the administration, rather than in an area so sensitive to banking.

Recently, J. A. Livingston, a well known financial columnist, wrote:

All men are products of their careers. A banker thinks like a banker, a lawyer like a lawyer, a politician like a politician, a newspaperman like a newspaperman. Backgrounds inevitably govern attitudes.

Habits of thought will reinforce any financial conflicts of interest. No matter how objective an official tries to be, he will lean the way he has leaned most of his life.

Mr. Livingston's remarks obviously apply to those three top men at the Treasury Department as well as to the new addition, James Smith, who will be a special assistant for congressional relations. Mr. Smith, of course, was a Washington lobbyist for the American Bankers Association and worked under the direction of Mr. Walker, the chief lobbyist.

Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post carries a column by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak which points up the potential for conflicts of interest in the Treasury Department. This column describes the tax loopholes which exist for commercial banks and on which the Treasury Department now makes decisions.

In making these decisions, can the bankers at the Treasury Department render an independent judgment completely devoid of their past relationships with the banks?

Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of this Evans-Novak column:

BANKS' MOVE TO OPEN OLD LOOPHOLE WILL PROVIDE TEST OF TAX RETURN

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The suddenly sprouting Congressional urge for tax reform will get an early test when

the banking industry, which usually wins what it wants in Washington, attempts to pry open a recently closed tax loophole.

The closing came last fall in a quiet, clever maneuver by Stanley Surrey, winding up eight frustrating years as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for tax policy. With a stroke of the pen, Surrey boosted by an estimated \$100 million a year taxes paid by commercial banks.

As Surrey was well aware, both the outgoing Johnson team and the incoming Nixon team at the Treasury had ties to the banking industry which made it all but impossible to overrule his regulation. Thus, only Congress can restore the bankers' tax advantage—a preview of similar confrontations between tax reform sentiment and lobbying pressure in the coming tax reform struggle.

Like most big industries, the bankers enjoy a special tax privilege: A tax formula permitting them to take an automatic deduction equal to 2.4 percent of their outstanding loans as a so-called bad debt reserve.

Since actual bad debts are well under 1 percent of loans, this formula amounts to a bountiful gift from Uncle Sam. This was precisely the view of Stan Surrey.

Surrey, an ardent tax reformer, had tasted more failure than success at the Treasury and last fall was chagrined when President Johnson suppressed his tax reform proposals. As a valedictory, therefore, Surrey began rewriting tax regulations in his closing days—including the one on bank taxation.

Instead of reducing the 2.4 percent, Surrey ruled that the bad debt percentage could not be applied to absolutely safe loans—most notably loans to the U.S. Government. Nobody knows exactly how much that will cost the bankers in 1969, but \$100 million is the educated guess. Accordingly, Surrey's stroke of the pen was an instant tax reform of major proportions.

Neither of Surrey's two superiors in the Johnson Treasury—Secretary Henry H. (Joe) Fowler or Under Secretary Joseph Barr—cared for the change. One report circulating among lobbyists is that Fowler was restrained from killing Surrey's rule change only when Surrey threatened to resign with a blast against the Johnson tax policy—a report confirmed by some and denied by others.

Adept at bureaucratic maneuvering, Surrey issued the change in regulations last October while Fowler was in Geneva for a monetary conference. Surrey's action could have been overruled in the Johnson Administration's closing days. But when Fowler resigned as Secretary in December, all hope expired for the bankers.

The reason: Barr, Fowler's successor as Secretary in those closing weeks, had accepted a post-Government job with a leading Washington bank—the American Security & Trust Co. Barr rightly felt constrained from interfering with Surrey's handiwork and so informed the banking industry.

That was particularly glum news for the bankers, because Barr's successor as Secretary in the Nixon Administration, David Kennedy, was coming to Washington from the Continental Illinois Bank in Chicago and was just as unwilling as Barr to bail out the banking industry at the risk of creating a conflict of interest.

The bankers' position became even bleaker when President-elect Nixon named as Under Secretary, No. 2 man in the department, the chief lobbyist of the banking industry: Charles Walker of the American Bankers Association. Walker, taking a surprisingly strong position for tax reform in nonbanking areas, must also avoid any seeming conflict-of-interest as an advocate of bankers' tax privileges.

Thus, bankers know their only hope is Congress. Legislation to overrule Surrey would take too long, but the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue could pass a resolution

instructing that Surrey's regulation be revised.

However, leading House tax-writers are unsympathetic to the bankers' position. Indeed, there is some feeling in Congress that Surrey did not go far enough and should have limited the bad debt deduction to the actual amount of losses—running at less than 1 percent—for an industry enjoying unprecedented profits. Whether that Congressional feeling persists should provide an accurate barometer for general tax reform.

Mr. Speaker, there are, of course, many other areas where Treasury decisionmaking directly affects the commercial banks.

In the banking and business community there is no greater issue than the question of the economic conglomerates being fueled through the one-bank holding companies. The closing of these loopholes in the Bank Holding Company Act will be one of the major legislative issues of this entire Congress.

The Treasury Department will be required to make specific recommendations on this issue. Yet the Secretary of the Treasury participated in the formation of just such a holding company while he served as chairman of the Continental Illinois National Bank of Chicago.

Now this is the man that must decide on the Treasury recommendations on one-bank holding companies. This is the man that must decide whether the holding company that he started in Chicago will continue.

Is this the kind of government in which the people can have confidence?

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAMP) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CAHILL, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. CAHILL, for 15 minutes, on February 20, 1969.

Mr. HALPERN, for 15 minutes, on February 20, 1969.

Mr. QUIE, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COHELAN, for 60 minutes, on February 20, 1969.

Mr. REUSS, for 60 minutes, on February 26, 1969.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MICHEL and to include extraneous material.

Mr. MONAGAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANDALL in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAMP) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. MIZE.

Mr. O'KONSKI.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan.

Mr. LUKENS.

Mr. ZWACH in two instances.

Mr. WOLD.

Mr. BRAY in two instances.

Mr. ZION.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. VANDER JAGT.

Mr. MCKNEALLY in three instances.

Mr. CLANCY.

Mr. LATTI.

Mr. WYMAN.

Mr. STEIGER of Arizona.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM in three instances.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona in five instances.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin in three instances.

Mr. STANTON in two instances.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ANDERSON of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PODELL in three instances.

Mr. PATMAN in two instances.

Mr. PEPPER.

Mr. BRADENAS in six instances.

Mr. GARMATZ.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. MINISH in two instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. FRIEDEL in two instances.

Mr. PICKLE in two instances.

Mr. WOLFF in two instances.

Mr. TIERNAN.

Mr. PATTEN in two instances.

Mr. DORN in two instances.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN.

Mr. TUNNEY in three instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 20, 1969 at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

521. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the Federal Housing Administration's decision not to require builder's cost certification for Rossmore Leisure World developments, Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

522. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report for 1968 on matters contained in the Helium Act (Public Law 86-777), pursuant to the provisions of section 16 of that act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

523. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a copy of a report on the activities of the Commission during fiscal year 1968 under the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act, pursuant to the provisions of that act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. ICHORD):

H.R. 7167. A bill to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of materials harmful to persons under the age of 18 years, and to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentations harmful to such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIESTER:

H.R. 7168. A bill to provide for the elimination of all grade crossings along the high-speed rail line between Washington and New York City; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 7169. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 7170. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENNEY:

H.R. 7171. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 7172. A bill to provide Federal assistance for special projects to demonstrate the effectiveness of programs to provide emergency care for heart attack victims by trained persons in specially equipped ambulances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 7173. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase to \$3,000 the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. NIX, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. SCHNEEBELI, Mr. DENT, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. YATRON, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. WHALLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. McDADDE, and Mr. WATKINS):

H.R. 7174. A bill to provide for orderly trade in footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 7175. A bill to amend the Disaster Relief Act of 1966 to provide for a national program of flood insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7176. A bill to amend section 501(c) (14) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from income taxation certain nonprofit corporations and associations organized to provide reserve funds for domestic building and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOUNTAIN (for himself, Mr. JONAS, Mr. LENNON, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. GALIFIANAKIS, Mr. MIZELL, Mr. FREYER of North Carolina, and Mr. RUTH):

H.R. 7177. A bill to extend public health protection with respect to cigarette smoking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7178. A bill, community college Omnibus bill, to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7179. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 7180. A bill to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOWARD:

H.R. 7181. A bill to provide Federal assistance for special projects to demonstrate the effectiveness of programs to provide emergency care for heart attack victims by trained persons in specially equipped ambulances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7182. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals and to prescribe its jurisdiction and functions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 7183. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.R. 7184. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McKNEALLY:

H.R. 7185. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for chiropractors' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts:

H.R. 7186. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to further promote the reliability, abundance, economy, and efficiency of bulk electric power supplies through regional and interregional coordination, to encourage the installation and use of improved extra-high-voltage facilities, to preserve the environment and conserve natural resources, to establish the National Council on the Environment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 7187. A bill to amend section 7701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify the tax status of certain professional associations and corporations formed under State law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 7188. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit the payment of annuities to a married couple on their combined wage record where that method of computation produces a higher combined annuity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7189. A bill to provide Federal assistance for special projects to demonstrate the effectiveness of programs to provide emergency care for heart attack victims by trained

persons in specially equipped ambulances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 7190. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to equalize the retirement pay of members of the uniformed services of equal rank and years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 7191. A bill to amend section 723, title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of dividends on certain national service life insurance issued on the term plan between April 25, 1951, and December 31, 1956, or thereafter converted; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWENDEL:

H.R. 7192. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that extended-care services follow hospitalization in order to qualify for payment thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 7193. A bill to expedite the interstate planning and coordination of a continuous Lewis and Clark Trail Highway; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7194. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 7195. A bill to extend for 2 years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. STEIGER of Arizona:

H.R. 7196. A bill to change the definition of ammunition for purposes of chapter 44 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 7197. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 7198. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7199. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen and clarify the law prohibiting the introduction, or manufacture for introduction, of switchblade knives into interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7200. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit small employees to deposit the income taxes which they have withheld on their employees on a quarterly (rather than a monthly or semi-monthly) basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 7201. A bill to amend title 18 and title 28 of the United States Code with respect to the trial and review of criminal actions involving obscenity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 7202. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to grant certain easements to owners of real property adjoining reservoirs under his jurisdiction; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLACKBURN (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON

of Georgia, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. RIEGLE, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HALPERN, and Mr. CLEVELAND):

H.R. 7203. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for the indexing of hearings of standing committees of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 7204. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the advancement of a post office of the second or third class to a higher class in unusual circumstances on the basis of estimates of revenue units for that post office by the Postmaster General, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 7205. A bill to establish a program under the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to encourage the production of vaccines for purposes of immunization during an epidemic of a virus; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DULSKI (for himself and Mr. CORBETT):

H.R. 7206. A bill to adjust the salaries of the Vice President of the United States and certain officers of the Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ESCH:

H.R. 7207. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 7208. A bill making an appropriation to the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 7209. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the basic workweeks of firefighting personnel of executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7210. A bill to include firefighters within the provisions of section 8336(c) of title 5, United States Code, relating to the retirement of Government employees engaged in certain hazardous occupations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GROSS (for himself and Mr. HALL):

H.R. 7211. A bill to require judges of courts of the United States to file confidential financial statements with the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNGATE:

H.R. 7212. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in honor of the dedication of the Winston Churchill Memorial and Library; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ICHORD (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PREYER of North Carolina, and Mr. ASHBROOK):

H.R. 7213. A bill to amend sections 102 and 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to provide that misbehavior in the presence of either House of Congress, or any committee or subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a misdemeanor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOCH:

H.R. 7214. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that individuals be appraised of records concerning them which are maintained by Government agencies; to the Committee on Operations.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 7215. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the U.S. Diplomatic Courier

Service; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 7216. A bill to authorize a 2-year program of financial assistance for all elementary and secondary school children in all of the States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 7217. A bill making an appropriation to the Office of Education to carry out the Bilingual Education Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BARING:

H.J. Res. 463. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit voluntary participation in prayer in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.J. Res. 464. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREY:

H.J. Res. 465. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of the Astronauts Memorial Commission to construct and erect with funds a memorial in the John F. Kennedy Space Center, Fla., or the immediate vicinity, to honor and commemorate the men who serve as astronauts in the U.S. space program; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.J. Res. 466. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.J. Res. 467. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.J. Res. 468. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States requiring the advice and consent of the House of Representatives in the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.J. Res. 469. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERLE:

H.J. Res. 470. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.J. Res. 471. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the continuance in office of Judges of the Supreme Court and of inferior courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.J. Res. 472. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN (for himself, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FARBERSTEIN, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of California,

Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. NIX, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PATTEN, Mr. PODELL, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. PURCELL, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. WIGGINS, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON):

H. Con. Res. 144. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to reduced air fares for children, youth, and members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. VIGORITO, Mr. CLARK, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. BEALL of Maryland, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. WAMPLER):

H. Con. Res. 145. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that U.S. Route 219 should be designated as part of the Interstate System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H. Con. Res. 146. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the emigration of Jewish residents from certain Arab nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. Res. 259. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the studies, investigations, and inquiries authorized by House Resolution 189; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. Res. 260. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 143; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H. Res. 261. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States and other governments of the world offer asylum to Iraqi Jews; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H. Res. 262. Resolution to amend rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

22. By Mr. BARING: Joint resolution by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada vigorously opposing any increase or decrease in the grazing fees on Federal lands until such time as the Public Land Law Review Commission completes its studies and urges the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior of the United States to reconsider the action already taken to increase such fees; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 7218. A bill for the relief of Mario Cavallere; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7219. A bill for the relief of Arturo Cortina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7220. A bill for the relief of Filippo LiParoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7221. A bill for the relief of Winston Nurse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 7222. A bill for the relief of Michele Anastasi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 7223. A bill for the relief of Antonio Campana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7224. A bill for the relief of Natale Starrantino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 7225. A bill for the relief of Angela and Konstantinos Pittas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 7226. A bill for the relief of Franco Avorio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7227. A bill for the relief of Santo Claravino and Lucia Claravino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7228. A bill for the relief of Vito Di Giovanni, Caterina Di Giovanni, and their children, Antonino and Vittorio Di Giovanni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7229. A bill for the relief of Lourdes P. Laranang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7230. A bill for the relief of Vita Serafino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7231. A bill for the relief of Herman James Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 7232. A bill for the relief of Rabea Arrad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.R. 7233. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lee Yin Har; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 7234. A bill for the relief of Josephine Mary Fitzpatrick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7235. A bill for the relief of Jeannine Gravelle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 7236. A bill for the relief of Lucrezia Adragna and her children, Gioacchino Adragna and Luciano Adragna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7237. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eufonio M. Aro and his wife, Lydia Lim Aro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7238. A bill for the relief of Dr. Aurora B. Capule; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7239. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cipoletta and his wife, Rita Cipoletta, and their children, Gaetano Cipoletta, Patrizia Cipoletta, Sabrina Cipoletta, and Antonia Cipoletta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7240. A bill for the relief of Socorro Cruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7241. A bill for the relief of Herman Hirsch and his wife, Elizabeth Hirsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7242. A bill for the relief of Soltan Illovits and his wife, Magdalena Illovits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7243. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Traiani Lissitsi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7244. A bill for the relief of Rene Louis and his son, Joseph Serge Louis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7245. A bill for the relief of Dr. Arvind J. Madhani, and his wife, Mandakini Madhani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7246. A bill for the relief of Carolina Messina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7247. A bill for the relief of Miriam Mischel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7248. A bill for the relief of Melbourne Murray; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7249. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Namio, and his wife, Anna Namio, and their child, Josefina Namio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7250. A bill for the relief of Dr. Peter

F. X. O'Neill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7251. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Santa Bufo Pagano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7252. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Antonio Petagine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7253. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Picatagi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7254. A bill for the relief of Dr. Leonidas B. Pulido and his wife, C. V. Pulido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7255. A bill for the relief of Ruth Quijano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7256. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Vacca, his wife, Carmela Vacca, and their child, Sergio Vacca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 7257. A bill for the relief of Romeo C. del Rosario; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 7258. A bill for the relief of Alejandro Koo Castillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7259. A bill for the relief of Araceli O. Dacanay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7260. A bill for the relief of Felipe Martin De Abia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7261. A bill for the relief of Louise Segall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 7262. A bill for the relief of Noriko Susan Duke (Nakano); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 7263. A bill for the relief of Edward Wei-I Chen, his wife, Hean J. Chiang Chen, and their children, Bessie B. Chen, Henry J. Chen, and May J. Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 7264. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pearl C. Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7265. A bill for the relief of Piero Andrei and Luigia Andrei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7266. A bill for the relief of Dr. James Kurian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7267. A bill to require the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to reopen and redetermine the claim of Julius Deutsch against the Government of Poland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7268. A bill for the relief of Antonio Papulino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 7269. A bill for the relief of Anna Anzalone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7270. A bill for the relief of Rosario Anzalone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7271. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Careri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7272. A bill for the relief of Giuseppina Gabaldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7273. A bill for the relief of Democrate Gabaldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7274. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Gugliotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7275. A bill for the relief of Candida Lo Gatto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7276. A bill for the relief of Leandro Napoleone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI (by request):

H.R. 7277. A bill for the relief of Napoleon M. Palafas (also known as Peter Steele); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7278. A bill for the relief of Nikolaos M. Parkas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7279. A bill for the relief of Graziella and Libora Spinnato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 7280. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Alfonso Vancheri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 7281. A bill for the relief of Miss Ekaterini Therglaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 7282. A bill for the relief of Arthur B. Silverstein; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McKNEALLY:

H.R. 7283. A bill for the relief of Ludevith Jager; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MESKILL:

H.R. 7284. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Carpinteri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 7285. A bill for the relief of Tribhuran K. Chhatpar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7286. A bill for the relief of Ohannes Abraham Oglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 7287. A bill for the relief of Bong Soon Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 7288. A bill for the relief of Emanuele Alaimo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7289. A bill for the relief of Maria Casamento and her minor son, Sergio Casamento; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7290. A bill for the relief of Calogero Mendola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7291. A bill for the relief of Antonio Monticciolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7292. A bill for the relief of Carlo Notaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 7293. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Masamitsu Isagawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7294. A bill for the relief of Miss Jenny Jo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7295. A bill for the relief of Consuelo H. Miranda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7296. A bill for the relief of Meteliko Tulasoa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7297. A bill for the relief of Rosie E. Valenzuela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 7298. A bill for the relief of Pietro Palazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 7299. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Oro Torjman Elancry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 7300. A bill for the relief of Hortensia del Carmen Rosende; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 7301. A bill to provide for the free entry of one Zeiss planetarium projector for the use of the Chicago (Ill.) Park District; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 7302. A bill for the relief of Rocco Riccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 7303. A bill for the relief of Haviv Schieber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 7304. A bill for the relief of Arminia DeBarros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.